

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

A Platform for the Free Discussion of
Issues in the Field of Religion and
Their Bearing on Education

JULY-SEPTEMBER, 1939



REPORTS FROM
THE OBERLIN MEETINGS

Trends in Progressive Religious Education

Frank M. McKibben

Survival Values in Jewish Religious Education

Isaac Landman

Growth in Religion

Hugh Hartsborne

Discussion on Professor Hartshorne's Paper

Points of Tension Between Progressive Religious Edu-
cation and Current Theological Trends

William Clayton Bower

Discussion on Professor Bower's Paper

Book Reviews and Notes

Religious Education

Seeks to present, on an adequate, scientific plane, those factors which make for improvement in religious and moral education. The Journal does not defend particular points of view, contributors alone being responsible for opinions expressed in their articles. It gives its authors entire freedom of expression, without official endorsement of any sort.

Articles in *Religious Education* are indexed in the EDUCATION INDEX, which is on file in educational institutions and public libraries.

Membership in the Association is \$4.00 or more per year, of which \$3.50 is for subscription to the Journal. Single copies, \$1.00 each.

LAIRD T. HITES, Editor

*Department of Psychology and Education,
Central YMCA College, Chicago*

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

FRANK M. MCKIBBEN, *Professor of Religious Education, Northwestern University, Chairman.*

H. L. BOWMAN, *Minister, First Presbyterian Church, Chicago.*

HEDLEY S. DIMOCK, *Dean, George Williams College, Chicago.*

PERCY R. HAYWARD, *Chairman of Editorial Board, International Council of Religious Education, Chicago.*

LEO L. HONOR, *Executive Secretary, Board of Jewish Education, Chicago.*

SHAILER MATHEWS, *Dean Emeritus, University of Chicago Divinity School.*

THORNTON W. MERRIAM, *Director, Northwestern University Board of Religion.*

CURTIS W. REESE, *Dean, Abraham Lincoln Centre, Chicago.*

REGINA WESTCOTT WIEMAN, *Consulting Psychologist and Lecturer, Chicago.*

The Religious Education Association

Publication Office, 404 N. Wesley Ave., Mount Morris, Ill.
Editorial Office, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Illinois

(Address all correspondence to the Editorial office)

Published quarterly. Printed in U.S.A.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

VOLUME XXXIV

JULY-SEPTEMBER, 1939

NUMBER 3

CONTENTS

	Page
Trends in Progressive Religious Education..... <i>Frank M. McKibben</i>	131
Survival Values in Jewish Religious Education..... <i>Isaac Landman</i>	135
Growth in Religion..... <i>Hugh Hartshorne</i>	143
Discussion on Professor Hartshorne's Paper.....	151
Points of Tension Between Progressive Religious Education and Current Theological Trends..... <i>William Clayton Bower</i>	164
Discussion on Professor Bower's Paper.....	172
Book Reviews and Notes.....	182

Entered as second-class matter July 31, 1935, at the post office at Mount Morris, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

The Annual Meeting and District Meetings

THE interaction of good minds upon topics of common interest and vital concern is stimulating and rewarding. One of the privileges of fellowship in the Religious Education Association is the opportunity for exchange of ideas with leaders in the field and for sharing in keen critical discussion on matters of current importance. The Association provides a fine platform for expression of creative thought and for examination of ideologies and methodologies. It is a healthy atmosphere for active minds. Many religious gatherings spend most of the time discussing ways of keeping machinery running. The R. E. A. has little machinery to run, and does not want any. Its meetings deal with basic ideas and fundamental philosophies, and at the same time keep close to concrete realities. It is a paying investment of time and money to attend.

In the pleasant surroundings of Oberlin College about seventy-five members assembled for the current Annual Meeting, April 23-25. Their papers and the gist of their discussion are published in this Journal. Beginning Sunday evening with words of wisdom from McKibben and Landman, continuing in informal sessions at Oberlin Inn on Sunday and Monday nights, and including the dinner Monday evening and les deux pieces de resistance given by Hartshorne and Bower on Monday and Tuesday mornings, there was not time enough for everyone to say what he thought and to ask half the questions he wanted to raise. Many said it was the best meeting in years. To read the reports in the Journal is good, but to share in the discussions and to hear Mrs. Fahs and the learned doctors trying to keep issues clear was far more stimulating.

Regional meetings have been held. Three only can be mentioned. There are now twenty districts organized, and we may expect interesting reports from different centres. The *Michigan* chapter had a most satisfactory meeting in conjunction with the annual meeting of the Progressive Education Association and Dr. Kenneth Heaton has arranged for similar gatherings of R. E. A. groups with the P. E. A. Dr. Lincoln B. Hale was the chief import for this meeting and a good panel discussion was held under the chairmanship of Dr. E. W. Blakeman of Ann Arbor. The general theme was "The Transition from School to College." A *Florida* conference was held at Winter Park under the able management of Mr. George Chindahl on May 5 and 6. Three themes occupied their attention—Objectives, Adult Education, and Future Leadership in Religious Education. There was a good attendance and sustained interest in the well planned program. In *Chicago* two meetings have been held to consider problems of Religion in Higher Education. The most recent was on July 13 at the Central Y.M.C.A., held in connection with a meeting of the Administrative Officers of Higher Educational Institutions at the University of Chicago. Dr. Stewart G. Cole was chairman and after a stimulating five hour discussion of the problem a continuing committee was appointed to carry forward studies in this field and plan later meetings.

If members in different sections of the country will write to the office, we shall be glad to furnish names of persons who have agreed to act as district chairmen. Every member of the R. E. A. is the nucleus of a duly constituted committee to help organize district meetings and to keep the good work going.

ERNEST J. CHAVE,
Executive Chairman.

TRENDS IN PROGRESSIVE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION*

FRANK M. McKIBBEN**

WHEN asked what are the trends in progressive religious education, one respondent countered with the query, "Is progressive religious education itself as yet a trend?" How, then, is one to discover "trends" within a movement that itself is little more than a "trend"?

It is difficult to locate trends in progressive religious education, for the movement is intangible, inadequately expressed, and limited in its application. In no situation does its practice bulk large. One finds here a little, there a little. Yet it exists, of that I am sure. About all one can do is to note the writings and speeches of those who profess to be progressive and observe what little practice may be found and endeavor to note the direction in which the movement seems to be going. Our being present at this convention testifies to the existence of the movement. For the Religious Education Association has always been something of an embodiment of the progressive spirit in the church life of America.

Can trends be located? None is pronounced. Some trends that are discernible seem to be moving in different directions at the same time. They remind one of the horseman who mounted his horse and rode off in all directions at once. Does the movement know where it is going? Is it lost? A traveller in New England lost his way. As he drove into a sleepy village he drew up to the curb in front of a villager half-asleep on a bench. He called out, "Fellow, can you tell me how far ahead it is to Newberry?" "Sorry, stranger," slowly replied the villager, "I don't know." "Well," inquired the traveller "how far back is it to Francetown?" "I don't know that either," the man an-

swered. Somewhat irritated the stranger exclaimed, "Well, what do you know?" "Wall," declared the townsman, with a twinkle in his eye, "I know I ain't lost." Do we know as much about progressive education? There are some who believe that it has lost its way.

It would be well, to begin with, to state some of the characteristics of this type of education, in order to make sure we all understand what we are talking about. Progressive religious education in its approach is open-minded, scientific, unrestricted, and functional. As to method its emphasis is placed upon creative thought and activity on the part of those participating in the learning process. It is primarily concerned with self-realization on the part of the participants. It seeks to provide for intelligent participation at every step in the process, and to develop in those so engaged the ability to evaluate their own activity to the end that it may be most effectively carried forward.

Its content, therefore, consists primarily of the every-day experiences and situations of life. These activities and experiences have an intrinsic worth in themselves. Materials, historic content, traditions, etc., enter the process, not as ends in themselves, but as means of furthering and enriching the life of the individuals and the group.

Such education is also marked by the relationship of learner to teacher, a relationship of sharing together in the process of learning and growing. The outcome of the learning or growth process cannot be predetermined; it must grow out of the interaction itself. Meanings, insights, values arise in the process and give direction to it. Progressive religious education is vigorously opposed to arbitrary indoctrination and authoritarianism. Insights, principles of living, current prac-

*Address, Sunday evening, April 23, 1939, at opening meeting of the Oberlin Convention of the Religious Education Association.

**Professor of Religious Education, Northwestern University.

tices of older people are to be shared, not imposed upon the young.

Central in its theory and practice is respect for personality, even that of the little child. It holds that such respect should be manifested by permitting the child at every stage of the educative process to give frankly and fearlessly its reactions to all that is going on, that the child should be encouraged to share vitally in determining the manner in which its growth is being directed, that it should be given the opportunity and responsibility for experiencing the results, good and bad, of the decisions in which it has taken part.

One of the first trends to be noted in religious education in general is the tendency to interpret the nature of religious education in terms harmonious with these characteristics of progressive education.

Professor Bower has interpreted religious education as "a vital and creative process. Its concern is to help growing persons at every age level to achieve a Christian way of living. This means helping persons and groups to face the actual situations that their world presents to them, and to resolve the issues involved in terms of Christian values and purposes. The great traditions of Christian thought, practices, and institutions are to be transmitted not as ends in themselves but as indispensable resources for understanding, changing, and bringing present experiences through to Christian outcomes. . . . Education takes place in the growing generation at the point where historic culture and contemporary living meet."

In his recent book, *Jesus and Educational Method*, Dean Weigle formulated this interpretation of religious education: "Teaching takes place wherever there is fellowship, involving communion, whereby the more mature and experienced members of a group lend counsel and aid to those who are less mature and experienced. The most elemental qualities that go into the making of a great educator are: his capacity for fellowship, the ability to reveal to his fellows new ho-

rizons, deeper insights, and higher goals, and the power to stimulate them, not only to vision and grasp, but to initiative and good-will."

Even the interpretation of education given in the Report of the Oxford Conference leans in the direction of progressive religious education: "Education is the process by which the community seeks to open its life to all individuals within it and enable them to take their part in it. It attempts to pass on to them its culture, including the standards by which it would have them live."

The next statements in the Oxford Report provide opportunity for educators to move sharply either to the right or to the left. "Where that culture is regarded as final the attempt is made to impose it on younger minds. Where it is viewed as a stage in a development, younger minds are trained to receive it and so to criticise it and improve it." Progressive religious education regards any culture as in a stage of development and is utterly opposed to "imposing it upon younger minds."

The point being stressed here is that in these statements of the nature of religious education, not all of them coming by any means from those who would call themselves progressive educators, it is possible to find evidences of the influence of those concepts that are at the center of progressive religious education.

A second trend that seems to be discernible is that those who believe in progressive religious education are reaffirming their faith in the validity and fundamental values of the progressive ideal and method. This is due in part to the opposition that has developed to the movement. I am able to detect no basic change in attitude toward, no serious questioning of the central thesis of, progressive education on the part of its exponents. In fact, in spite of strong reactionary forces at work in the field of religious education today, there seems to be a slow, steady growth of progressive practices over the country.

In the third place, there seems to be a

tendency within the movement to eliminate some of the fads, frills, and extremes that have become associated with it. Like all developments that are new and have enthusiastic supporters, it has been subject to misapplication and extreme forms of expression. One is reminded of the home in which a practical-minded mother had set a dish of spinach before a six-year-old child. The child did not want to eat it. About that time the father, a progressive "fan," came into the room. He endeavored to treat the child according to "progressive education" ideas. Failing to persuade the child to eat the spinach, he said, "Now, what would you like to eat?" "I want to eat a worm," declared the child. Thinking it proper to cooperate with the child, the father went to the garden and returned with a worm. "I don't want a woolly worm," the child protested. "I want a long slim one." The father went dutifully again to the garden. This time he returned with a long slim worm and placed it before the youngster. "I want Daddy to eat half of it," insisted the child. This was a stiff proposal for the father. But he ate half the worm in conformity with his theory, and passed the plate to the child. "Daddy ate my half," the youngster complained, and pushed the plate away. About that time the practical mother reappeared. Seeing the plate of spinach uneaten, she pushed it before the child again, saying, "Here, child, eat your spinach like a good girl." The child quietly ate her spinach!

Progressive religious education has had its utterly silly expressions. It has been carried to extremes. Some of its devotees have misunderstood its fundamental method. It is having to "grow up," as have all forward-looking movements. Many progressive educators are so enamored of the process that they are unable to evaluate objectively their own work. The movement will have to be saved from some of its proponents. This is occurring now to some extent.

A fourth trend may be discerned in the sincere effort that is being made to ex-

amine more carefully into the philosophical, theological and metaphysical framework in which progressive liberal religious education is set. This trend is testified to by the continuous and vigorous discussion of it in magazines, books, and conferences. Many will recall the discussions in the Professors' Advisory Section of the International Council of Religious Education last February. Turn back through the issues of RELIGIOUS EDUCATION and you will discover the pertinency of this issue: Bower, Coe, Smith, Cole, Homrighausen, to name just a few of those who have challenged the thought of all of us with their interpretations.

Here, truly, one feels that he is getting on a horse that is going off in all directions at once. One swing is to the right, led by those who feel that progressive religious education is superficial in its theology and metaphysics, that it has sold out to a liberalism that is already showing itself spiritually bankrupt. Another swing is to the extreme left, attempting to divorce itself from most of traditional ideology and basic positions in theology and seeking to relate itself ever more closely with the psychological and scientific approach to life and education. In between are those who are attempting to work out a synthesis of these two extremes, believing that there is much in each that should be salvaged and brought to bear upon the educative process.

The disposition to break loose from the customary and traditional conceptions and patterns of child study and nurture may be suggested as another trend among progressive religious educators. The feeling grows that we have not yet penetrated to the bottom of things, that we are still guessing, assuming, hoping that children grow in religious insight and experience as we think they do. With all our progressivism, it is altogether likely that we condition too arbitrarily and effectively the dominant reaction patterns of the young. This issue, likewise, is to be considered by this Con-

vention. In addition to the problems stated by Dr. Hartshorne in his preliminary paper,* there is the question, to what extent have we been unconscious of or overlooked the unity and continuity of the experience of the child, which makes his experiences in the public school and elsewhere *one* with his so-called specifically religious experience? How much "religious" or "spiritual" experience and training is to be found in the public school? Are those dealing with the young from different institutional approaches recognizing and contributing to the essential integrity of the child's personality?

These trends are seriously in the making and are likely to stimulate much careful research and investigation. Two developments are immanent:

First, it is altogether likely that there will be closer alliance between individuals and groups identified with progressive religious education and representatives and agencies working in general progressive educational circles. The conceptions of child nature and nurture and the concern for the enrichment and integration of child personality are held in common by both groups. At times there seems to be little to distinguish them from each other.

Second, there is a growing insistence upon the careful study of the experience of school children to discover the extent to which "spiritual" education takes place in the program of the public schools. It is increasingly felt that there are tremendous latent religious resources in public school curricula, that school situations are loaded with possibilities for spiritual development of a kind that progressive religious education is concerned for. What is the exact situation with respect to these two considerations, and what can be done about them?

The last trend to be mentioned is a tendency on the part of progressive religious educators to come to grips even more realistically with problems related

to the social environment. There is growing realization that as education deals with life it dare not omit from its consideration any problem of either immediate or remote social significance. This means that progressive religious education is bound to seem more and more radical.

The main concern of liberal educators, however, will be to discover how to deal with these aspects in an effective manner without at the same time thrusting the immature into situations that are obviously beyond their ability fully to understand and cope with. There is recognition that much has been done in social education that is woefully ineffective and superficial on the one hand, and that is unfair and injurious to the immature on the other. It is being realized that social change cannot be effected as quickly and thoroughly as has been assumed by liberals.

This last consideration is leading progressive educators to restudy social strategy. They are consequently inclined to broaden their base of operation in attempting to effect social change. This is particularly noticeable in the disposition to recognize and seek cooperation with individuals, groups, and agencies that are pointed in the same direction in which it is felt Christian reconstruction should move. How far and fast this tendency will operate is anybody's guess. But it suggests that both its reference to the guidance of individuals, especially the immature, in participative activity in social change and to group action, progressive religious educators are in need of careful restudy of both direction and methodology.

In closing may we state again that it is difficult to claim that these aspects of the movement may be safely referred to as "trends." They may represent little more than issues, problems, and aspects that in some future day we may refer back to as the situations giving rise to trends that have found expression in the years immediately ahead.

*Published in the April-June issue of RELIGIOUS EDUCATION, and elaborated in this current issue of the journal.

SURVIVAL VALUES IN JEWISH RELIGIOUS EDUCATION*

ISAAC LANDMAN**

I

DISCUSSING the Jews' "unique place in the educational history of antiquity," Elmer Harrison Wilds stresses that "education has been the prime force in their national and racial existence." Dr. Wilds avers: "The greatest lesson to be drawn from the history of the Jews is that a strict adherence to an educational system based on a peculiarly high religious and moral ideal has preserved the unity of the race in a way that no political system could approximate. The salvation of this people has been due to its education."

Thomas Davidson writes in his study of the history of education: "One lesson, above all, Jewish education has to teach us, that the most important element in all education is moral discipline. The Greek with his art and his philosophy, and the Roman with his law and his statesmanship, have vanished from the face of the earth; but the Jew, with his moral discipline, his Torah and his Talmud, is still with us, as strong and ready for life's struggle as ever."

In these paragraphs, both educators catch the spirit and essence of the chief survival values in this people's seemingly stiff-necked will-to-live. It is the stress the Jews have laid on the educational process, from the primitive days of Gideon (circa 1200 B.C.) for whom a lad of the town could write down the names of the princes of Succoth, and the elders thereof, seventy and seven men (Judges 8:14) to the latest exhortations in behalf of Jewish education.

One might debate at some length with Dr. Wilds as to what he connotes by the

terms "national" and "racial." The facts of history attest that the Jews ceased to be a nation in the commonly accepted sense of the term since the year 70 of the Christian Era; and the judgments of both science and history would indicate that the Jews are by no means a pure race.

Similarly, one might argue with Dr. Davidson concerning his limiting the materials of Jewish education to the Torah and the Talmud. Modern Jewish religious schools emphasize the Prophets over and above the Torah; and the Talmud is rarely read. In the United States it is taught almost exclusively in our Theological Seminaries, and only on rarest occasions is it used as a text or direct source book either in schools for children or adults.

Whether or not the Jews constitute a nation or a race, whether or not their production of educational material ceased at the end of the fifth century with the Talmud, is of no consequence in this essay. Of importance to us is the fact that analysts, such as the men quoted, attribute to an educational system the salvation of the Jews in the past and their preparedness to carry on life's struggle in the present. This system is built on the disciplines of religion and morals; it is Jewish pedagogic history, however, that in Judaism these disciplines are *one*, inseparable; and a third, equally unified with these two, is the intellectual discipline. The primary function of the Synagogue, even before it became a Beth Hatefillah, a house of prayer, is a Beth Hamidrash, a house of study.

II

Now, if we are to seek an aim, a purpose, an objective for religious education without channeling these into a prim definition, we seem to have them here: *to educate for survival*. But the particular system of religious education under

*Address, Sunday evening, April 23, 1939, at opening meeting of the Oberlin Convention of the Religious Education Association.

**Rabbi, Congregation Beth Elohim, Brooklyn, New York.

1. *The Foundations of Modern Education*, pages 60-77.

2. *A History of Education*, page 85.

discussion, a system in which survival values are judged to be inherent, is unique in that in its nature and in its processes Jewish education has always been progressive.

I use the term "progressive" here and throughout the paper not in the scientific, technical sense, but in its ordinary connotation of continuously advancing, constantly improving processes and skills; and in its adjustment and adaptation, in content and method, to the new conditions in which Jews lived and the new circumstances in which they found themselves in different ages and under differing environment.

Let me put my thought differently, borrowing a recognized and ancient pedagogical approach in Jewish educational method, by asking questions: What are the survival values in religious education? How is the survival objective to be attained? Is it to be achieved by the inculcation of certain theological doctrines or by so conditioning those subjected to the process as to fit them, en masse, to meet and overcome a long series of most crucial circumstances such, for instance, as have destroyed people other than the Jews?

If it be the former, then the matter is simple. We really have no problem. Primacy must be accorded the Bible, "this word" which we have been commanded to observe to do, without adding thereto, nor diminishing therefrom (Deut. 13:1), "the law" from which one jot or tittle shall in no wise pass away till heaven and earth pass away (Matt. 5:18). There is the church history, the lives and adventures of the church heroes, the catechisms, the doctrines of the fear of God, reward and punishment, heaven and hell.

If it be the latter, then we have the ethical content of religion, the instruction regarding what God requires of humans as set forth in the Old Testament and the New; the progressive adaptation and application of this instruction to the varied environment and the differing political and economic conditions; the increasing intellectual outreaching to absorb knowl-

edge and such truth as we have been vouchsafed; to apply knowledge, ethics and faith to the moulding of survival values—that is, values that are independent of time, place, circumstance, and even interpretation—as the goal which religious education is to achieve.

The most commonly accepted definition of applied religion is the now trite phrase: it is a way of life (*Derech Hayyim* is the Hebrew phrase). If religion is a way of life, that is, if it is functional, then it is meant to work. If it is meant to work, then education in religion cannot remain at a standstill, either in content or in method. The test of religious education, then, is in its values more than in its content and method. In method it should be flexible, sensitive and responsive to change; in content it should be pertinent to current human experience and applicable to that life of which religion is presumed to be the way.

III

Let it be known that we have fundamentalists in Judaism. To them, as to fundamentalists in Christianity, religion is static; the Torah is the record of the word of God made for all time; revelation is a one-time non-recurrent phenomenon. In the practical application of the Bible word, however, Jewish educational history constitutes a continuous evolution of interpretations of the ancient law to make it compatible with new times and conditions, with new economic and political developments that demanded change and adaptation for survival value. And Jewish educators are agreed in principle that the Jewish religion, in order that it may function in the present day for the present generation towards the spiritual conditioning of its adherents to build a Jewish way of life compatible with the American scene, must combine our progressive educational tradition in the general sense with the methods of progressive education in the scientific technical sense. Just as secular education aims at rebuilding our pedagogy to educate American youth for

the present day living, so Jewish religious education strives, in addition, to inspirit Jews with our ancient survival values of religious, moral and intellectual disciplines to vanquish modern attempts to destroy our people.

Pedagogically speaking, the chief essential in progressive religious education is said to be that it "finds its first impulse in some present interest, problem or need, felt or aroused."³ To answer this impulse, to solve this problem, to satisfy this need, progressive religious education employs instruction in the doctrines or beliefs of any given religious group. In Jewish religious education a third essential is present: that the instruction tie up with Jewish experience as it springs from, and is emphasized in, Jewish history and tradition. For Jewish education aims to instill the commanding loyalty of the pupil or student to his people as well as to his faith, and what his people conceives as its mission among men. It is a combination of the historic past, the living present, and an envisioned future.

For this same reason Jewish education aims to develop not merely personalities that will love God, love their neighbors, live ethically, and contribute to humane and philanthropic causes (all, incidentally, gifts of the creative Jewish genius to religion and civilization), but likewise to mould individualities possessed of transcendent faith that, as Jews, they are covenanted with God, individually and collectively, to maintain, to hold aloft, to strengthen and to promote those ideals until all men have translated them into social action. This is a prophetic role.

Such a program may be criticized, of course, in that it implies a phase of separatism which runs contrary to technical progressivism. There is a peculiar combination of particularism and universalism in Judaism which is as yet not fully understood even by the rank and file of Jewish educators. This combination, however, definitely fuses the chief aspects of

technical progressive education with the Jewish survival values. It is on the road toward achieving the integration of the Jew into the community and toward the acquisition of the common culture by virtue of normal uninhibited participation in all communal and cultural activity.

Perhaps the best example to illustrate what I have in mind is the manner in which we use the educational material offered by the story of the Exodus. We never cease to emphasize the cultivation of such humane, such modern instruction in the Torah, the authority for which is the reiteration to "remember that you were slaves in Egypt"; such as, "Love ye therefore the stranger, for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt" (Deut. 10:19); "The stranger that sojourneth with you shall be unto you as the home-born among you, and thou shalt love him as thyself; for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt" (Lev. 19:34). Simultaneously, however, we take the occasion of the Pass-over festival, the celebration of the Exodus, to emphasize the interpretation that every Jew living today must consider himself as if he had been brought out of Egypt. In this way the Jewish educator binds the modern Jew in loyalty to his people and instructs him, from his own religious sources and historic experience in the ideals of modern democracy.

IV

Of Jewish education it may well be said that its objective has never been to teach subjects, but to instruct people. In most of the books on religious education written by non-Jews, that I have read, I find consistent misunderstanding of the materials and the sources we employ in Jewish education. "Torah" and "Talmud" appear to these writers to be textbooks, in the form of textbooks commonly employed in secular education. To correct the erroneous tradition that Judaism is a religion of Law, and that, therefore, the Torah and the Talmud are the books of Law which hold the material of Jewish education, it ought to be here observed

3. A. J. Wm. Myers, *Teaching Religion Creatively*, page 107.

that the word "Torah" does not mean *Law* at all; it means "instruction." And the very word "Talmud" means "teaching."

The fact that the Jewish educational process possesses one five-foot shelf, compiled after an approximate thousand years of experience, called "instruction"; and another, compiled 750 years later (at the close of the fifth century of the Christian Era) called "teaching," would indicate that the progressive element was not lacking in Jewish educational content and method, even 1500 years ago.

Whereas most non-Jewish educators who touch on Jewish education seem to be of the opinion that our source material was garnered in the Bible and sealed with the Talmud, it is an obvious fact in the history of Jewish education that change and adaptation have been continuous down to this day.

The Middle Ages witnessed the codification in a series of Codes of the vast accumulation of instructional materials of the almost 2,000 years preceding. Simultaneously, the philosophers of the Middle Ages reinterpreted Bible, Talmud, and Codes in accordance with the new knowledge, the new science, the rediscovered speculations regarding the universe and the God of the Greeks and Arabs, to provide a newer, and at that time more modern, mass of instructional material.

In other words, the content material and the processes of Jewish education have continually undergone change and adaptation in the democratic American sense; adapting the universal truths that have been the heritage of the Jew from ages past to the new conditions and circumstances in which the Jews found themselves, and to the new knowledge which men were vouchsafed.

What we have here is the combination, the fusion of progress and tradition, already referred to. It appears to me that Liberalism must recognize Traditionalism in religious educational procedures. Progressive principles cannot, and should not, cut away entirely from the past which holds such source material of great value.

On the other hand, progressive method cannot fail to adjust the heritage of the past to the new knowledge, especially in an age when secular culture dominates the lives and thoughts of men, and needs no longer to go to Church or Synagogue to find its wells of living waters.

V

Modern trends in Jewish education, therefore, are abandoning the old curricular methods which began with the teaching of the Bible creation story to the littlest child, and ended with the closing chapters of the Bible, but retains the Bible as precious source material. Jewish education today is employing the selective process of Bible stories and Bible characters, heroes of Talmudic times and of the Dark and Middle Ages, to fit the immediate objective which the instructor has in view.

Perhaps what I have in mind can best be illustrated by a quaint bit of pedagogical method which dates back a thousand years or more and which probably is still employed in Eastern Europe. When a lad reached the age where he could begin to read the Bible in Hebrew, instruction in the original text began not with the Book of Genesis, but with the Book of Leviticus. Now, if there is any part of the Bible which obviously has no message for a child and the content of which might be judged as utterly devoid of elements for character and personality building, it is the opening chapters of the Book of Leviticus. But without any knowledge whatever of the rules of pedagogy or the ideals of technical progressive education, the old Rabbinic method used to introduce the boy to the Hebrew of the Book of Leviticus in order to condition him as a Jew wherever he may live to the knowledge that life calls for sacrifice; for the principle of sharing; for the performance of duties to the House of God as represented in the Temple of ancient days and in the Synagogue of his day; in short, and in the phraseology of modern progressive educators, *the principle of cooperation.*

Moreover, Jewish education is advanced by the religious instruction that centers in the seasons of the year when the three ancient yet modernly interpreted pilgrimage festivals recur; and by our definitely historical and strictly religious festivals.

We are aided by the instruction that the Sabbath celebration in the home emphasizes the consecration of the human spirit as well as rest and recreation for the human body; by the call to guard the blessing of liberty and the prayers for the day when all men shall be free, as emphasized in the home celebration of the Passover; by the recurrent reminder of the giving of the Commandments at Sinai on Shabuoth (Pentecost), now the festival on which we hold our Confirmation Service and formally welcome our adolescents into the Household of Israel; by stressing the bounty of Providence on Succoth (the Feast of Booths), the ancient harvest festival which, notwithstanding that they became urbanites, the Jews have celebrated during twenty centuries, never failing in this country to underscore that Succoth is the origin of the American Thanksgiving Day; by the Hanukah Festival (the Feast of Lights) which we dramatize as the first battle man ever waged for religious freedom, a basic doctrine in the American Bill of Rights; by the joyous acclamation of God's guardianship over Israel in the Purim Festival, when the Jews were saved from the machinations against them by the ancient Haman who sought to destroy us, not failing to stress God's protection of us from the hands of the modern Hamans.

And, in the classroom, to attain our objectives in religious instruction, we encourage our instructors to the utmost freedom of interpretation and the use of the allegorical method employed by the Rabbis of old in the Midrash and the Talmud, by the philosophers of the Middle Ages, by the progressive educators in our own time. With the exception of the doctrine of the one, universal God, beside whom there is none else, we have no

dogmas with which we must indoctrinate our children. Bible miracles we teach as natural phenomena; the miracles which are being daily discovered by the physical and biological sciences, as the work of God's hands; and the inexorability of the moral and ethical law, which comes from God as does the cosmic law.

VI

Probably the most important trend in Jewish education is our recognition that while the Bible, because it is the classic record of the Jews' God-experience for a thousand years, because of the universal applicability of its ethical idealism, because of its creative prophetism and because of its outreaching towards an all-embracing social action that must inevitably bring nearer the universal hope of human brotherhood, is still our chief source material, yet it is a collection of books that was not primarily written for children.

The Bible, in Jewish educational procedure, is not merely a record of past experience; it is alive this day. The revelations sealed within its covers are an on-going process. In its contents are truths that transcend space and time. It is as modern as our international chaos, on the one hand, and our striving for social justice, on the other. At our worship on Sabbaths and Holy Days, the ritual regularly reminds our people that "this is your heritage, O House of Israel."

The emancipation of the Jews and our free and untrammelled participation in the life of democratic nations, have caused us to rediscover the ancient book to a greater degree than have biblical criticism and archaeology. In the progress of our education the Bible has become more than ever what Shaver terms "the qualitative source" in the curriculum.

But we do not stop with the Bible; nor with the Talmud which is an interpretation of the Bible for a later age; nor with the Philosophers or Codes of a still later

4. Erwin L. Shaver, *Present-Day Trends in Religious Education*, page 96.

day. On a Sabbath Eve we pray: "O Lord, open our eyes that we may see and welcome all truth, whether shining from the annals of ancient revelations or reaching us through the seers of our own time; for Thou hidest not Thy light from any generation of Thy children that feel after Thee and seek Thy guidance."⁵

As regards worship, Jewish educators have not achieved sufficiently for our children and our youth. For their worship we have been in the habit of merely simplifying the traditional prayers of the ritual. This system is exceedingly unsatisfactory, especially for the adolescents. The situation was best expressed a few years ago at the graduation exercises of our Religious High School. A young man presenting a paper entitled "Youth Looks at Judaism," and speaking for his class, had the courage to say the following to his teachers and his elders:

"For most people as young as we, ordinary worship has neither meaning nor interest. True, we can see in prayer spiritual comfort for those who need it to face the problems of the outside world, and purging of the soul from those on whose consciences some misdeed preys. But for ourselves at our present age, there is little need for either service that prayer offers us, for we have had no problems to cope with that left us with our backs against the wall, nor have we committed any cardinal sins.

"The one other conception of prayer, that the individual can bargain with God to obtain divine aid in material quests, is entirely repulsive to anyone who pictures Deity as a God of Justice.

"Accordingly, we find that, for us, the only value a religious service holds is as instruction. The only interest youth has in the Temple service is in the sermon, and then only when the sermon says something."⁶

We are departmentalizing our schools of religious education. We have recog-

nized, for instance, that Religious School assemblies which include children of pre-school age to high school years are pedagogical nonsense.

Practically all of our Religious Schools now insist upon trained teachers; usually these instructors are selected from among those of our faith in the public school systems. The pedagogic advantage here is that these men and women already possess method, and need to be trained only in content.

The religious education of our children as it is evolving in America, therefore, is predicated on this double objective: *first*, to equip them with the ancient, historically tested Jewish religious and moral values that will prepare them to live normal Jewish lives as Americans under our democratic institutions; and *second*, to fortify them with the ancient, historically tested survival values that will hold them loyal to the Jewish people and to fit them consciously as Jews to contribute creatively and constructively to the fulfillment of the mission which the Jews, rightly or wrongly, deem themselves to have been selected to contribute to the progress of human civilization and culture.

VII

Recent trends in our group are definitely and urgently emphasizing the importance of religious education for adults. It is only within the past two decades that Jewish educators have begun to rescue from oblivion that ancient principle of Jewish education, which accentuates education as a never-ending process from childhood till death.

Jewish education in America for the past two generations centered almost wholly on the child, due primarily to the eagerness with which our immigrant sires sought to lead their children through the secular Americanization process. With the systematized religious education for the child well in view, the education or re-education of our adults is emerging both as a progressive and an active movement.

5. Union Prayer Book, page 32.

6. From a manuscript in the records of Congregation Beth Elohim Religious School.

We are advantaged in this current trend by the fact that we are adopting at the outset modern pedagogical methods and the traditional application of progressive reinterpretation of our content material. If the religious education or re-education of adults is to be of any value whatever, it must start from the basis of adult experience and adult intellectualism. Here is where intellectual discipline is especially added to the concretely religious or moral disciplines.

We are confronted with a distinct and definite problem in adult religious education; namely, to recapture at least into the educational phase of Synagogue activities that group of adults who, for one reason or another, are indifferent to the spiritual side of the Synagogue, which has been and is now again recognized to be the heart and center of Jewish survival values.

In the experiments being made with adults, progressive direction in the technical sense is definitely made the norm for the new organization of academies, schools, colleges, institutes. The general trend in curriculum-making is to abandon the lecture program and the forums, and to concentrate on consecutive periods of classroom work in specific fields of Jewish history and of Jewish religion. The main purpose is to restudy the whole gamut of the Jewish experience, attacking the content from the mature, the adult, the intellectual point of view. The whole objective is to equip the adult to understand himself as a Jew, and the long experience that has made him what he is, and thus to integrate him more fully and completely in the modern American scene.

The Bible is studied from the critical point of view. Bible criticism, it may appear startling to report, will some day soon be discovered as a radical Jewish invention, a dark and sinister Jewish plot to undermine all religion.

When Jeremiah teaches, "for I spoke not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt-

offerings or sacrifices" (7:22); when the ancient teacher of the Book of Amos climaxes the Prophet's attack on the ritualism of his day with the question: "Did ye bring unto Me sacrifices and offerings in the wilderness forty years, O House of Israel?" (5:25), we behold the first Bible teachers who were Bible critics, who explored the past and plumbed the present in search for religious truth.

When Bishop Athanasius, whose theology triumphed at the Council of Nicea, quotes a Jewish authority that the Psalms were collected by a Prophet in the Babylonian Exile, that the anonymous Psalms were not written by David but by this Prophet, we have evidence of Bible criticism by a Jewish teacher of the 4th or 3rd century of the Common Era.

When Abraham ibn Ezra, the poet and Bible commentator, senses that beginning with Isaiah 40 we have a book written by a prophet other than the author of the preceding 39 chapters, we have Bible criticism by a Jew of the 12th century of the Common Era.

And, of course, everybody knows that Spinoza's "Tractatus Theologico-Politicus," in which he was the first to point out contradictory statements in the Bible, and in which he rejected all attempts at the harmonization and conciliation of the theologians, was the 17th century starting point of the modern scientific method applied to Bible study, without aid from the Archaeologists.

Historically speaking, therefore, adult Jewish education progressively has approached Bible study from the critical, the scientific point of view. So now, present-day Jewish scholarship examines the study of the Talmud and the later Codes from the historical, the critical approach.

In a similar manner, we are applying the same method to our religion and its history. We are teaching Judaism as an evolutionary experience. We compare the periodic trends in this evolutionary process with the religions that were current among the peoples with whom the Jews

came in contact. This is true not only of the religion of Bible times, but since. We do not recoil from making clear that certain elements, attitudes, customs and practices, even doctrines, now definitely and historically Jewish, were stimulated as a result of these contacts. But we do not neglect to emphasize how the Jewish religious genius recast and remolded the suggestions picked up in the course of our contactual way, into the attitudes, beliefs, doctrines which we now cherish as our own.

Among these might be mentioned circumcision, which is pre-Biblical; the Sabbath of the Bible, which, as it is commanded there, is probably the greatest piece of social legislation which any people has contributed to the social order; the doctrine of immortality which is post-Biblical; Bar Mitzvah and Confirmation which trace to the contact with Christianity; the intellectual love of God which is a gift of the mediaeval philosophers.

The criticism might well be offered that in such a program for the religious education or re-education of adult Jews, the method is almost entirely intellectual. Throughout the history of Jewish education, it always has been. In intellectual discipline lie deeply imbedded the roots of Jewish survival value.

Faith, in the emotional connotation of the word, is engendered only in childhood and youth. In the modern day of free and compulsory education, of the new scientific knowledge which even the high school boy and girl absorb in a measure, of untrammelled thinking, of the abandoning of supernatural authority as the source of doctrine and dogma, it is quite impossible to generate faith, in its general acceptance, even in post-adolescents. I do not believe that we can educate in Faith. I doubt whether we can retrieve faith in an adult, except through the power of ideas.

Religious instruction for adults, to attain any results whatever, must, therefore, make its approach both in method and content from the mature, the adult, the

intellectual and scientific point of view. And we of the Synagogue have good authority for this, running straight back from the modern reformers of the era of political and social emancipation, back to the philosophers of the Middle Ages, back to the Rabbinic teachers of the Talmudic era, back to the Prophets of the Bible.

VIII

In the history of Jewish education, the Prophets symbolize what religious instruction ought to be. They were creative, progressive thinkers, who interpreted world change in terms of that world outlook that centers in the ethical monotheism which embraces humanity. These Prophets were progressive religious teachers. They feared only God and not man. And it was their Torah, their instruction, their concepts of religion and of God and of Society that have given the survival values to the Jews, as it is this day. To preserve both religion and humanity in our time, religious education must turn to them as exemplars.

As in the days of the Prophets, so today, a new social era is being forged out of the scrap iron of the old. Once more we are living in an age when "there is no truth, no mercy, nor knowledge of God in the world; swearing and lying and stealing break all bounds and blood toucheth blood" (Hosea 4:1-2).

Perhaps we can recapture Faith if, like these Prophets of old, we possess ourselves of the courage to "cease trusting in lying words that cannot profit" (Jer. 7:8) and of the hardihood "to root out and to pull down and to destroy and to overthrow, to build and to plant" (Jer. 1:10).

Because the political leaders of the nations lack moral and ethical stamina, and because our religious leaders are pussy-footing as regards God, if religion is to survive, if civilization and culture are to survive, then our religious educators, like those ancient prophets, must hear the call to creative thinking, fearless speaking and courageous action.

GROWTH IN RELIGION*

HUGH HARTSHORNE**

"WE do not know what children will do when, among the circumstances to which they adjust, there is this faith in their capacity to grow in religion—that is, a profound respect for them as persons."***

We have not altogether succeeded in separating the personal from the non-personal in our environments or even in ourselves. We tend to deal with persons as though they were like physical objects whose behavior is independent of the symbolic expressions of our attitudes. Water freezes when we put it in the appropriate place, but persons freeze if we merely *say we want* to put them in the appropriate place. In making this comment I am not taking any position regarding the possibility of expressing all personal behavior in general laws. I am not discussing free will and determinism. Rather I am suggesting that until the most significant factor in the environment of an individual, viz., the attitudes of other individuals, is taken into account, we can make no workable generalizations regarding his behavior as a person.

The scientific study of persons is still further complicated by the fact that the responses of an individual are a function not merely of objective situations, including the actions of others, but also of his

interpretations of these stimuli. In the case of the actions of others, such interpretations are easily mistaken, based as they are not only on explicit conduct but also on symbolic material such as speech and gesture.

As far as I know, the meanings of conventional gestures have all to be learned. We have no innate understanding of grimaces and threatening movements, much less of the far more subtle attitudes with which we are bombarded by our fellows.

In the third place, what we do, and therefore what we are and become, is a function of our own attitudes toward others. Since these attitudes, like those of other persons, are expressed in part by gestures and symbols easily misunderstood, and since others are responding to us and thus creating our social environment in terms of what they think our attitudes are, the total inter-personal situation in which we live and grow is extremely complex and fluid and would be entirely unworkable if it were not for the fact that standardized meanings are assigned to standardized gestures and symbols which, when learned, constitute a stable framework within which life may be pursued without disaster. The level of this life and its degree of fixation at its level depend on the nature of these patterns of meaning.

Now there are those who hold that the relation of an individual to God rests on some other foundation than the acquired operations of his nervous system; that God has direct access to the personality or self. This may indeed take the form of a sense experience, such as hearing a voice, but the experience itself is a self authenticating experience not of an object, or of another human being, but of God. To those who have had such experiences, or who hold this view, the analyses psychology makes of this process

*Paper read Monday morning, April 24, 1939, before the Oberlin Convention of the Religious Education Association. In the morning and afternoon sessions on Monday the paper was vigorously discussed. The principal points raised in the discussion are presented by Professor Harrison S. Elliott on pages 151-163. *Editor*

**Research Associate in Religion, Yale University.

***From the article by the author, pages 8-10 of *RELIGIOUS EDUCATION* for January-March, 1939, entitled "The Need for Fresh Study of Childhood Religion." It may also be noted that the central issues involved in the problem of religious growth are listed in the author's article entitled "The Study of Growth in Religion," in *RELIGIOUS EDUCATION* for April-June, 1939, pp. 67-69.

are unconvincing, or irrelevant. Such persons are irritated by efforts to discover the conditions or laws of occurrence of such experiences. It is like trying to discover the beauty of some great poem by a technical analysis of its meter, form, grammar, or vocabulary without ever reading the poem itself.

The maligned psychologist would not only accept but would affirm the reality of the experience reported as an experience of God, particularly in these three respects:

1. It is essentially intimate, singular, unique.

2. It is essentially a non-social or individual or solitary experience—between a man and his God.

3. The interest of the one who has the experience is directed not toward the experience but toward the object. The object is for him the significant thing. God is wholly and overwhelmingly other.

These, however, are characteristics of everyday experience, not just of the experience of God. A child's first doll comes with the same uniqueness. The experience is unique. No other person ever had or could ever have *this* experience. It is not concerned primarily with anybody else—though social attitudes may arise from it. It is essentially a transaction between the child and the doll. But what matters to the child is the *Doll*. It is something not himself but precious beyond all expression.

So the experience of falling in love, as others have frequently noted. For the lover it has all the characteristics of the self validating religious experience, including the supreme value of the loved object of whom the lover is utterly unworthy. It is fortunate that this attitude is possible for a race that has only one way of perpetuating itself.

But when we love anything with the devotion of a child to a doll or a lover to his lady, we do so only by virtue of our capacity to ignore its or her imperfections. Indeed the imperfections themselves may only serve to enhance our

appreciation of the virtues, so that we can say, "She loves him because of his habit of twiddling his fingers in a certain way," or "because of a peculiar twitch of an eyebrow." Dolls can be thus loved without any restraint whatsoever, as the strange contraptions which call forth a child's devotion will testify. And people, likewise, it would seem, so far as their external appearance is concerned. But few would love a man *because* he was a murderer. The words should be "in spite of," and involve one in a type of relationship of man to man which is far more complex and far-reaching than the simple and direct response of a child to a doll, or a man to a maid, or a man to the sort of God the experience of whom is the unique and solitary experience of something or someone wholly apart from ourselves.

The position psychology might well take regarding the pertinence of analysis would be that only by analysis can any experience yield its maximum values or become communicable. If the assertion is made that religious experiences are in the nature of the case all that they could be and are necessarily incommunicable, the critic would have to respond that in these respects they are then immature and should be outgrown or transformed in the interest of the very values they seek. Certainly without rigorous analysis for the sake of discovering the conditions and laws of religious growth, the claims of the isolationists will be to others chiefly matters of curiosity.

It was asserted a moment ago that the correct interpretation of the attitudes of other persons on which actual life depends, was something which had to be learned. For primitive man, the same thing was true of the physical world. Knowing nothing of natural law, he interpreted what happened in the world around him in terms of a favorable or unfavorable attitude on the part of whatever being controlled what happened. The emergence of natural science has changed all that. Instead of teaching our children

to submit to or to propitiate the rain God, we teach him to predict the weather and adjust his conduct to a series of cause-effect relations. Even to the prescientific Elijah, God was not in the earthquake or fire.

But increasingly, science is intruding on the operations of the human mind and discovering cause-effect relations in conduct which enable us to predict what a person of known characteristics will do in response to specified stimuli. We know, e.g., that, treated as they are treated, children will develop what we call conscience, which represents the will of the parents at first and later is generalized in terms of self chosen ideals by describable and controllable processes. Will some new Elijah say, "God is not in the still small voice?"

Although the Hebrew-Christian tradition has hesitated to admit it, there is implicit in its growing insights a denial that a person, whether human or divine, is either subject or object, i.e., that in person to person relationships either can be wholly other. Witness the Jewish aversion to images which so easily turn into idols and the unwillingness to pronounce the name of Jahweh. An idol or a name, which is a sort of idol, tends to stamp its referent with a fixity of form or of character which is foreign to the very essence of the idea of personality. Persons are not isolated objects but terms in a dynamic relationship. Peculiar to the Jewish faith was Jahweh's *relationship* to his people. The nature of this relationship was given fresh meanings from generation to generation as men themselves discovered new meanings in their relationship to one another, so that the relationship itself escaped in time from the false limitations of any definition of it, and was known and experienced in its dynamic and creative essence: not God, nor man, as wholly separate entities, but "spirit" as embracing both and expressing a differentiated totality.

This communal character of personality was the core of the Jewish religion and was expressed by them in the covenant

between them, as a people, and Jahweh. The law and the prophetic reinterpretations of law bound the people into an ethical unity to one another on the one hand, and to God on the other, but the mutual obligations of the people included their mutual relations to Jahweh.

This notion of religious community, however, needs to be sharply distinguished from two contrasting types of religion, viz., mysticism and nationalism, the one tending to substitute God for man, and the other, the state or institution for man. Both destroy the dynamic, creative relationship out of which personality emerges and through which personality grows.

The Jewish-Christian tradition has, of course, exhibited both mystic and institutional deviations in various degrees at various times, but it has repeatedly recoiled to take up again the main trend toward individual emancipation. This continued effort to define the individual and establish his rights and obligations as seeking and possessing value has assumed the inevitably dual role of legalism and prophecy. Each represents a basic character of the human organism which finds social expression in fixed social patterns on the one hand and in revolution on the other. Both trends belong to the evolving self, for the one is concerned with the conservation of values achieved in the past, and the other with the projection and achievement of new values. Thus the one tends to emphasize the past and live in the past while the other tends to substitute the hope of a possible future for the assumed blessings of the present. Both are necessary to human progress. Both have at times been combined in a harmonious and balanced life focused on the present. Whether the culmination of the religious drive toward community occurred, with the Jewish faith, in the person of Jesus, or in some other character, or has yet to appear, we may take Jesus' emphasis on the present as illustrative of the full meaning of the creative relationship of men to one another—a relationship which is experienced in the fulfillment of both law and

prophecy because it includes both God and man in an ethical unity of such overwhelmingly present significance as to overshadow both the past and the future.

Jesus was neither mystic nor priest, neither lawgiver nor prophet. For him the moment of creative reality, the moment when values become facts, when possibilities are realized in achievements, when dreams come true is the present moment when a particular and concrete realization of mutuality between men is experienced as mutuality with God.

Now and then one comes on a popular prejudice which seems to feel that anything we learn is somehow less real or less true than something we know by intuition or by some inborn gift, or some grace added by God without our having learned it. It is easy to understand this prejudice. As children the things we are made to learn are often uninteresting and seemingly of no importance, whereas we find ourselves in the possession of skills, attitudes and points of view of great importance to us which we cannot recall learning. Many of the fundamental attitudes toward persons and the subtle ways we have of dealing with them are picked up in this unconscious way. This presents a most interesting and important psychological problem: How can we sort out the attitudes, ideas and skills which constitute a creative relationship from those which hamper or destroy such a relationship, and make conscious the processes by which they are acquired? And if we do so and learn how to control these processes, will we have destroyed their religious quality or made them less significant? Will we have brought religion under bondage to science or will we thus free religion by arranging situations in which persons may be so related to one another that the creative possibilities of this relationship may be achieved? Does the power to predict what some of the products of such a process will be detract from their reality or their religious quality?

Answers to these questions depend in

part on the nature of creativity.

The creative processes in which man shares seem to consist at the present time in the rearrangement of parts in such a way that new structures or organizations emerge. These organizations are our objects—the reals of the physical world. By fumbling and by experiment, man “makes” such new objects more quickly than does nature. What he does is creative in the only sense, according to Spearman¹, in which mind can be creative. He finds “x” when he knows “a” and the relation between “a” and the unknown “x.” The relationship he knows because he knows how “c” and “d” are related. This may be expressed as

$$a:x :: c:d$$

It is essential, if x is to become a part of one's world of objects, that one recognize that x, when found, fulfils the stated requirements.

Although this recognition is never validated without the help of others' observations, which transform the hypothetical construct into a real object, a great deal of such procedure is solitary in modern life. This is a sophisticated outgrowth of the natural processes of learning, however, in which children explore together the world into which they are born, discover relationships and resemblances, and make new objects for themselves. The first impulse of a child who has thus made something is to show it to someone else. If by action or gesture this person shows that the object is understood and appreciated, the child not only has established the reality and significance of what he has made but has also experienced something quite different from his object, viz., a fellowship or a community or a mutuality made possible by the presence and action of the other person. If the second individual had been indifferent or hostile or annoyed, or contemptuous, there would have been no sharing or fellowship, and

¹Spearman, C., *Creative Mind*. His formula reads: “When any item and a relation to it are present to mind, then the mind can generate in itself another item so related.”

the second individual would have remained a mere force or thing to be avoided.

I have mentioned only the last step in the creative process—the step of validation. But it is equally true of all the other steps we take in working out solutions to our problems—the framing of the issue, the search for possible solutions, the selection of proposals for experiment, the conduct of the experiment, the concluding success or failure in the production of the idea or object or experience which does or does not satisfy the demands of the problem. Naturally the more significant the issues, then the more significant the sharing, the more vital and creative the fellowship, the greater the emerging personality. Thus we move all the way from the temporary joint action of crowds, which are productive of only a primitive form of personality, up through regimented action under authority to the free cooperation of adults and growing children in a family.

We have noted how the character of the activity affects the relationship involved. Let us see how the relationships, in turn, affect the character of the activity. Take a few typical relations—dominance-submission of master and slave, sexual love, parental love, mutually hostile individuals, and mutually cooperative individuals each of whom thinks of the other as worth listening to and in that respect, at least, the equal of the other. When fully developed, the last relationship is the democratic relationship in which the recognition of differences in capacity is associated with the sense of equality of worth as persons, i.e., mutual respect.

It is only in this latter type of relation that individuals are able to associate with each other in the discovery of the unknown "x." In other relations, there is only the coercion of one by the other, or the sense of superiority and inferiority which inhibits imagination and the free exchange of ideas. Whenever in any of the alternative relations there is such a free exchange, at this point the relation of mutuality tends for the moment to replace

the other relation, as when a parent suddenly comes to respect a child who has solved a problem, or later, because of this added respect, admits him for a moment to a problem he is himself facing and shares with the child in the creative act of finding some unknown "x" which will solve it.

The persons that emerge out of experiences of mutuality are not isolated objects. They are parts of a pattern of relationships. Each organism contributes to the total pattern a distinctive subpattern, but the meaning of the subpattern is found in its relation to the whole. If this relation were conceived in static terms it would wholly falsify the picture, as e.g. in Fascism, in which the individual exists only for the state. In the dynamic system of which I am speaking no preexistent whole determines the parts. The whole is built afresh with each new association of the parts in a joint effort to work out a joint solution to a common problem, whether this be the making of a toy, or the conduct of a nation, or the destiny of mankind. The "whole" is the creative relationship.

Presumably the play of children is the chief source of such relations, soon outgrown as adult culture replaces the free interchange of children's ideas. Some of this spirit survives in adult culture, of course, and still more in the child culture that is transmitted direct from children to children without ever being absorbed into the culture of adults.

Just as progressive education has learned a great deal about the nature and capacities of children and the ways by which they learn by watching them at play, so may we learn something of the psychological roots of religion by observing what happens when potential persons are in such a relationship with one another as will permit and stimulate the social process of creative thinking.

But we are not content with roots. We want flowers and fruits. It is here that we make the characteristic mistake of adulthood. We think we can give the growing

child the flowers and fruits we have produced. We do not trust them; indeed, we hardly ever trust anyone, old or young, to produce his own. As long as we persist in this self-centered mood we shall never learn what religion really is or may be, for we shall never permit relationships between persons or the products of these relationships to deviate from established stereotypes. It is this attitude which occasions prophetic revolutions and the momentary upflaring of religious experience in some genius or group strong enough to break through the ice of custom to the living water waiting for release.

We shall not proceed far in establishing the creative relationship out of which emerge both social consciousness and God consciousness, without specifying more clearly the things that must be learned by those who are to cooperate in this venture. Our assumption (that the products of a genuinely creative relationship are not predetermined) demands that we state these objectives in terms of skills and processes, not in terms of products. It presupposes that we have confidence in human nature, and therefore in the total reality of which it is a part, to hold on to what has been found good and to choose the better as rapidly as it shows itself to be better. So all good has come into being and been preserved. We shall only make conscious and more certain and rapid this process of emerging good.

As we set out on this difficult task of discovering the skills and processes the learning of which constitutes religious growth, we come at once on the materials with which these skills and processes deal, viz., the physical world and human nature in both its original and cultural forms. The first set of facts we are in a fair way to deal with by the method of scientific discovery, experiment and control, but even so, at many points we find ourselves obstructed by ignorance or powerlessness and the more we know the more certain we become that human nature is ultimately doomed to annihilation. While the crude efforts of primitive man to substi-

tute imaginative constructs for the realities of nature are being rapidly replaced by knowledge of natural law in the conduct of daily life, there are emerging new problems of human destiny, unfaced by primitive men, for which science offers no hope of solution. We are defeated by our very knowledge. Consequently we have not yet outgrown the need for interpretations or dogmas, belief in which protects us from the devastating consequences of facing the realities of our manifest destiny.

But in our knowledge of man we have not progressed so far as in our knowledge of the physical world. Indeed we have advanced little beyond the stage of the primitive. Like our primordial ancestors, we are still confronted by the conflict between organic desire and the conditions of social life out of which have come the protective interpretations or myths which objectify both the struggle and the forces in conflict. We are unable to face the horrors of our own inner life or the realities of man's brutality to man.

There are two circumstances which tend to loosen the power of traditional dogmas to save us from our helplessness in the presence of forces beyond our control. One is that the type of childhood experience on which religious dogma has long been based, viz., the unconscious dependence of the child on the protective parents and his ambivalent attitudes toward them, is tending to be replaced by other relationships which leave no early experience on which ideas of the protective God could be based. The other is that even where these ideas emerge in appropriate symbols in the mind of the frustrated adult he finds no confirmation of them in the beliefs of those with whom he associates.

It would seem apparent that the continued usefulness of institutional dogma depends on the continuance of child-parent relations which counteract the very principle of person to person relations on which the growth of persons depends, and on the continued teaching of these dogmas by methods which lead religion down the

bypaths of legalism and institutionalism from which it is ever trying to escape. The theory and procedure of the Catholic church is entirely logical in emphasizing the dominance of the church, the authority of parents, the heresy of doubt as to its dogma, and the early indoctrination of all its constituents. Growth in religion within this type of religion can easily be observed. When confronted with a totally different culture, such religion is embarrassed by its inflexibility: it must dominate or die. This accounts for the hostility of the Catholic church to the democratization of the state, the family, and the educational process.

There is no question as to the serious risks involved in any procedure which undermines either general belief in the ancient protective dogmas of the church, or substitutes for relationships of authority and obedience those of cooperation and mutuality.

Nevertheless, within the Jewish-Christian tradition are the seeds of this alternative and nothing but the union of totalitarian religion and the totalitarian state can prevent the growth of these seeds—and even so, only for a time.

By halting and uneven steps and with many backward slips humanity moves toward democracy. The evolution of religion parallels this movement. It is as great a mistake to think of religion as once perfected in the past as to imagine that men once lived in a golden age which it is our task to reproduce. Religious growth is a function of culture. We may study what it has been. We cannot by this process discover what it may be under other conditions.

Our present anomalous position in religious education arises from the lag of religious ideas and customs. Derived from predemocratic social structures and prescientific ways of thought, contemporary religion offers no support for the democratic way. Just as in patriarchal societies a form of religion arose which fitted the needs of men who understood little or nothing of the world in which they lived,

so today there must grow from the actual life men lead a religious interpretation which will illuminate rather than darken the daily life of the individual and the destiny of the race.

As we grow more aware of what constitute the conditions of creative group life we try to establish these conditions so that we may increase our skill. It is out of these relations, rather than out of their substitutes and opposites, that our new insights as to life's meaning must come. A religion for democracy must issue from the democratic process itself. A religion derived from other types of social structure cannot be clamped upon it.

The consequence of this view is that we must make a fresh start on the discovery of what religion is, and on how children grow in religion. The beginning of such a search is the placing of children in situations in which they may be persons in socially creative relations with one another and with their leaders. As former religious dogmas or interpretations arose from childhood experience in meeting life's problems, so our new interpretations are likely to emerge as we share with children in their own effort to find the larger meaning of the experience of fellowship.

There has been enough of such experience in times past for us to guess at what this meaning will be. The Bible is full of such insights. They will not be insights for the children unless they themselves grow them in their own experience.

I see no way, therefore, of dissociating the study of religious growth from the conduct of experiments in religious education. And I see no way of making these experiments fruitful save by engaging children in the democratic process.

This is extremely difficult, since in our culture children are not treated as persons but as subjects or pawns to be moved around according to the convenience of adults. Participation in significant activities is largely denied them. Nevertheless a beginning can and must be made. To begin intelligently requires a plan and a

set of basic concepts or propositions for the guidance of the experiment.

The major proposition must concern itself with a tentative formulation of the nature of religion. In the article already quoted I suggested the following: "Religion is the relationship of men with one another and with the larger reality on which they believe themselves and their values to depend, of which they become aware when frustrated in their quest for complete self-realization by internal or external circumstances and forces seemingly beyond their direct control; together with the meanings by which they interpret this relationship and the practices by which they implement this quest."

Taking this as a brief summary of what has been said so far, we can take the next steps in framing our presuppositions. I have done this in my book *Character in Human Relations*, but can restate the more important here. They grow out of the basic concept which underlies the democratic process, viz., the concept of social-religious functioning. Religion as just defined is a way of functioning, i.e., of performing one's part in a dynamic relationship. The relationship we are concerned with is that of men to one another and to the whole of reality. The democratic relationship is not other than the religious relationship but is religious when it has certain characteristics such as purposefulness, skill, sense of belonging, co-operative spirit, joy, and perspective. Religion is functioning in life's everyday relations on this level.

Our problem now becomes one of giving children a chance to function in these ways, which is another way of saying, to be persons.

Just what meanings will be engendered by this process remains to be seen. The hypothesis is that these meanings or interpretations will provide the new "dogmas"³ for democratic religion and serve as tools for meeting the frustrations

which our contingent life makes inevitable. It further assumes that in the course of this experience more helpful ideas of God will emerge which will replace the patriarchal ideas appropriate to a patriarchal society. The clue to such ideas may be found in the Biblical concepts of justice and love, which are asserted to characterize equally man's dealings with man and God's dealings with man. Thus God may become truly personal because he, like human persons, will emerge as "person" out of the experience of fellowship in so far as this experience is discovered to be the focus of our ultimate loyalty, the source of our best selves, and goal of all our endeavor.

Such a religion will never be a mature religion, but will always be a maturing religion. Its "dogmas" will be experimentally derived and subject to change as new light on life's meaning comes through experience. They will not be taught as authoritative truth but acquired by experience and reflection on experience. They will define the most fruitful relationship of men to their world and so serve as the basis of security in doubt and trouble because they are rooted in a perspective which embraces not only the present but the past and the future and because they are concerned with an eternal process and not with a temporal product.

Once such a point of view is agreed upon, small beginnings can be made in any situation in which a leader, so convinced, is with children. It can be made by adopting an attitude toward children and a relationship with them which fulfils the conditions stated. The leader drops the characteristic roles of dictator, instructor, or guide and becomes a catalyst. The New Testament reports of Jesus' activity afford an excellent example. He did not preach or dictate. He asked questions and told stories which helped his hearers to rethink their problems. He never gave anybody anything and even when he exercised his healing power he did so by calling forth in the sick man the will and faith which were the conditions of health. He stim-

³The term of course ceases to be appropriate and should be changed to one which can mediate security without stultifying thought.

ulated people to do things for themselves and never did anything for them. He was a catalyst. Things happened when he was around, not because he had a doctrine to teach or a program to put over or a curriculum to transmit, but because he treated every one as a person and took the initiative in establishing between himself and others a relationship in which what they did assumed a fresh importance and created self confidence and self respect.

Just how far children of any age can be expected to rise to this level of interrelationship remains to be discovered. Naturally those not trained in the skills of these relationships and acts will not be able at once to exhibit them. They must be acquired by beginning wherever the individual or the group is and moving always toward greater flexibility, freedom of thought, and democracy of procedure.

The tragedy of our present world situation lies in our not having done these things. We are the victims of our own failure to sort out the vital, growing features of our Jewish-Christian tradition and of our lack of faith in God's way with

men. We assert our belief in the spirit of brotherhood but deny that men can be taught to be brothers. If we wait long enough for God to teach us doubtless he will, by the sore road of universal catastrophe. We call it God's judgment, but we do nothing to correct the situation we assert he is judging. Repentance, particularly our repentance, is not enough. The times demand action. We may be too late. But whether we are or not, we should have learned by now that to adopt any policy which denies to men their full rights as persons is to fly in the face of providence and to continue the very conditions which we claim will result in the destruction of civilization. Fail though we may, our only hope is to move along the ways that we are learning are the ways of God and begin now, in every situation, to deal with men as persons, and most of all to reconstruct every educational task we face so that it shall yield as much as we can make it yield of those experiences of fellowship and mutuality which are the lifeblood of both democracy and religion.

DISCUSSION ON PROFESSOR HARTSHORNE'S PAPER

THE chairman, Professor Elliott, suggested that there were three main lines of thought in the paper which should be kept in mind in the discussion: *first*, the present situation offers a threat to religious values and security; *second*, in the particular processes in which we are interested we have failed to develop bases for security comparable with those offered by the older processes; and *third*, we know how to transmit an authoritative form of religion, but we have not become skilled in the processes of creative religious education and it is in this area that we must do our experimenting in relation to growth in religion.

The consideration of Dr. Hartshorne's paper was opened by comments of three

people who had been asked in advance to open the discussion. The first of these was Professor Paul Schilpp of Northwestern University; the second Dr. Emanuel Gamoran, of the Commission on Jewish Education, Cincinnati, and the third Mrs. Sophia Lyon Fahs of Union Theological Seminary.

Professor Paul Schilpp*:

I think Professor Hartshorne's paper can make a significant contribution to thinking wherever the problems of child nature and nurture are discussed, and wherever men are concerned with the problems of democracy, of personality, of

*Professor of Philosophy, Northwestern University.

religion, and of the influence of culture patterns.

He has laid his finger in a most significant fashion upon some of the major problems in these fields and made us conscious, on the one hand, of some of the difficulties and contradictions in educational and religious theory and practice, and, on the other hand, of some of the directions in which we need to go, if—from the standpoint of intelligent religious educators—we would wisely cope with the problems and resolve the contradictions.

Permit me to limit myself in my part of the discussion to those problems in which as a philosopher I may have some more or less well formed opinions.

Here, obviously, belong three aspects of the problem raised by Mr. Hartshorne's paper which raise questions concerning the basic philosophical or theological points of view, particularly with respect to their perhaps reciprocal influence upon religion and upon the development of the religious life—on the part, perhaps, more of mature society than on that of the child.

Here also belongs the question of the social and spiritual milieu in which it is (or is *not*) possible to raise *personalities*, as well as questions as to what type of religion can undergird our faith in a commitment to *democracy*; as well as the further question, on what religious and spiritual grounds democracy itself can be justified; and the whole interesting problem of the making of personality through social relation and mutuality.

Professor Hartshorne has, I think, laid his finger on a very important point in our understanding of the growth of religion within the developing life of the individual, and of religion in general, when he points out that *religion has not kept step with man's other changing attitudes* towards life, towards the universe at large, and towards society in particular.

There can be no denying the fact that religion, for the most part, is still in the patriarchal imperialistic stage, where God reigns as king or is, even when he is con-

ceived as Father, thought of in terms of the absolutism with which the Oriental "master of the house" ruled his household. For most religious people God is still today absolute ruler and monarch. This conception has definite, far reaching and continuous consequences in men's entire attitude towards any problems of or behavior in religion. It colors the religious man's entire outlook upon every aspect of his religion.

How important this problem is may also be seen by the fact that in Europe popular and traditional religion, as well as academic theology, is today definitely swinging back to a new emphasis on this patriarchal, imperialistic position. Nor is this the case merely in the totalitarian states. It is quite universal in Europe: almost as much in England—witness the to us almost medieval-sounding major emphasis of the Edinburgh Conference of 1937!—and in Sweden (I listened recently to Professor Lindstrom of Lund on this subject) as in Germany. It is almost as much in evidence in Oxford University as on the Continent; as much in Barthianism as in the more orthodox formulations of accepted Nazi theology. The notion of God as the "Wholly Other" is, after all, only the logically extreme conclusion of a patriarchal, imperialistic religion.

Nor need we deceive ourselves into believing that these positions are confined to Europe. Even in America they are finding all too ready acceptance among our fundamentalist friends, to whom such a position is quite natural, of course—and also, sad to relate, among leading theologians who would be quite insulted if you called them fundamentalists, such as Edwin Lewis of Drew, Paul Tillich and Reinhold Niebuhr of Union, William Pauck of Chicago Theological Seminary, and Charles Clayton Morrison of the *Christian Century*. Whether they like it or not, what they really represent may rightfully be called Neo-Fundamentalism. This Neo-Fundamentalism may differ from the old Fundamentalism in not being half so crude; in fact, it usually is

quite academic, scholarly, and learned. But in its basic nature it is definitely related to what we have known in this country as Fundamentalism. For it is all of the following:

1. Otherworldly instead of earthly;
2. God-centered instead of man-centered;
3. Original sin-conscious instead of conscious of man's divine nature and possibilities;
4. Backward looking instead of forward looking;
5. Revelation committed instead of personality committed;
6. Hierarchical-patriarchal instead of democratic;
7. Static instead of dynamic;
8. Absolutistic instead of relativistic;
9. Transcendent instead of immanent;
10. Supernatural instead of natural.

It is true enough that any religious, theological, or philosophical position needs squarely and frankly to face up to the sordid, cruel, barbarous, and savage aspects of humanity's life and behavior. It simply will not do to pass all this by with a nicely poetic, but hopelessly sentimentalistic and unrealistic remark about "heaven lying about our infancy." It is true enough that there is likely to lie as much hell about a modern infant as has ever been found in human history.

But, on the other hand, is it not just as unrealistic and unscientific to permit the dastardly and barbarous events of the past twenty-five or more years, particularly of the past ten, suddenly so to becloud our vision that we must all at once take refuge in a new medievalism with its wholly one-sided and therefore basically misleading emphasis on the so-called depravity of human nature? One should imagine that at least philosophers or theologians could get a somewhat more long-range view of things than to let themselves thus to be swept off their feet by recent events. Not a hundred Mussolinis or a thousand Hitlers or ten thousand

Stalins should, after all, be able to dull our recognition of the basically moral or spiritual capacities of every normal human being!

To bring out those capacities, to give their development a real chance—that, after all, is the real ultimate task of any religious education worthy of the name. And in this task we cannot permit ourselves to recognize defeat, though there be as many devils in Berlin, Rome, Moscow, Tokyo, New York, or Chicago as there are tiles on the roofs. **THIS IS OUR JOB!** From it we can recede only at the expense of losing our *own* soul.

And how is that to be done? Not, obviously, by closing our eyes to any facts of human nature or conduct, no matter how dastardly. Nor by trying to whitewash such behavior! But, also, not by suddenly denying or explaining away man's spiritual possibilities. But rather: *by growing men*, real men, rational men, moral men, spiritual men.

And this, again, can only be increasingly achieved by giving the growth of such men a real chance by the right kind of environment and cultural and religious pattern.

As Mr. Hartshorne has rightly said: we cannot expect to safeguard the preservation and promotion of democracy and of democratic procedure in the long run in the midst of a society whose *religious* pattern and theological indoctrination is imperialistic, patriarchal. If it is true that the Christian spirit truly is the spirit of democracy, if it is further true that real spiritual Christianity can survive only in a society committed to the growth and development of free creative personalities, then we simply have got to get busy at the fundamental task of revamping our long-since *passé* and outmoded religious conceptions and theological formulations and develop a type of religious consciousness and milieu in which the individual as well as society will not constantly find itself inwardly in conflict between opposing social, political, and religious concepts.

Our job, therefore, is terrifically large.

We must develop a religion and theology fit for this age and I do not think we have done this to any degree as yet.

And we must attack this problem at all fronts at once:

1. At the level of childhood religion and nurture,
2. At the level of religious growth of adolescence, especially college students;
3. At the level of our theological seminaries;
4. At the level of society at large.

Does religious education have a task?

I wonder whether any one could have a bigger task than this.

It is our privilege and opportunity to rise to this occasion.

Dr. Emanuel Gamoran:*

In reading Professor Hartshorne's paper, I was struck by two problems to which I tried to give some thought preceding our convention. One was the problem of what constitutes "religious experience" for a child. The other was, what is the nature of religion. I tried to think back to my own religious experiences. One in particular came to me. It was in connection with my own Bar Mitzvah (the Jewish ceremony corresponding to Confirmation for Christians). As is well known this ceremony takes place when a boy reaches the age of 13. Mine was held in a traditionally Orthodox, Chasidic Synagogue. As part of the ceremony the boy is expected to chant certain blessings preceding and succeeding the reading from the Torah, as well as to chant a portion from the prophets appropriate to the day, and also in some cases to deliver an address. The address which I was to deliver was an involved discussion on the subject of the importance of concentration during prayer. The address was prepared by the rabbi. By now I have forgotten all of it except the first sentence.

There is one incident, however, that I

shall never forget. I recall that when I rose to go over to the pulpit to deliver this address, my father, of blessed memory, rose with me. According to custom he should have remained in his seat, pretending to be unconcerned about how his youngster would get along; but he did not follow this custom. He rose, came over to the pulpit, covered himself completely with his prayer shawl—so completely that I could not see his face, and remained there throughout the period of my address. When I was through I caught a glimpse of his face. That moment impressed me more than anything else in relation to my Bar Mitzvah. Thinking and feeling very deeply on that occasion it was obvious that his silent meditation was accompanied by tears which the prayer shawl hid from those that surrounded him. There was a consciousness on my part that I must prove myself worthy of the hopes and aspirations of my father.

Was this a religious experience, and if so why? Was it religious because it was associated with a Jewish religious ceremony? There is no doubt that it was a vital religious experience for me. What made it so?

Two months ago I was preparing my own boy for his Bar Mitzvah. It is the traditional custom that when a boy reaches the age of 13 he is expected to put on phylacteries every morning, and to recite the morning prayers. The phylacteries contain passages from the Bible. I continued this practice myself from the age of 13 until about 18 or 19. Should I advise my boy to put them on or not? The traditional Orthodox Jewish attitude is that this ceremony is exceedingly important and should be universally observed. On the other hand, thousands and thousands of Jews, especially among the moderns, no longer observe this custom. After giving this problem considerable thought I decided to advise my boy to put on the phylacteries and to recite his prayers daily. I explained their significance to him and also why I did it. I said to him, "If you think you would like to do it I shall be

*Educational Director, Commission on Jewish Education, Cincinnati, Ohio.

glad for you to do it. It would make me very happy. You would learn to know the prayers. You would feel yourself at one with the Jewish past." He said, "Yes, I shall do it." I had a certain satisfaction in this response. Was this a religious experience or not?

In talking both of these experiences over with a friend, we came to the conclusion that both experiences, my own when I was a child, as well as my present experience in relation to my boy were religious experiences, for this reason—that *anything may be considered a religious experience in which there is an element of striving or triumph in the direction of the ideal*. Both experiences involved elements of aspiration toward the ideal.

Now as to Dr. Hartshorne's definition of religion, perhaps we are not in disagreement; perhaps it is just a question of emphasis. Religion, it seems to me is not so much concerned with a conception of reality. The study of reality, the study of the world, the universe in which we live, is a function of science and not of religion. It is the purpose of science to attain continuously more adequate conceptions of reality. Religion concerns itself not so much with the discovery or with a description of reality, but with our desires, with our aspirations, with our intentions *to change reality*. I might say religion concerns itself more with *ideality* than with *reality*. Since in religion we are concerned primarily with ideals, with aspirations, with values, the God of religion becomes significant not so much as the Creator but as the *End* of life who becomes the summation of all our highest and noblest purposes. This, of course, will sound heterodox to those who hold traditional views of deity. However, there is some ground in Jewish tradition for this kind of a conception, for Jewish tradition thinks of man as the partner of God in the works of creation—a co-creator. If man works in the direction of values and ideals, he is creating a better world. He is helping to bring God into the universe.

But there is an important corollary

which follows from this conception of religion and that is that if religion lies in the area of our ideals and our aspirations, then it must concern itself with the problem of evil. Thus any conception of religion which would take away the responsibility for evil in the universe from men, would be unsatisfactory from this point of view. For if religion operates in the area of ideals and aspirations its function in relation to evil, is to resist it. The conception that evil must not be resisted and that it can be eliminated without resistance is, then, it seems to me, a mistaken one.

Thinking of religion in terms of the spirit reflected in Dr. Hartshorne's paper, all education is religious education. The only function of the Jewish religious school as a separate school is that of transmitting to the child the traditional Jewish culture in so far as it possesses beauty and truth and goodness and furthers the aspirations of our young toward these ends. There are certain aesthetic values, cultural values, as well as universal values to be derived from the culture of a people as old as is the Jewish people. And when that culture is so completely interwoven with a religious view of life that the sacred and the secular seem to be almost indistinguishable from each other, the value of inducting the young into such a heritage is quite evident. This, it seems to me, would be true of every group that has a culture that is distinctive and that has specific values of language, of literature, of aesthetics to transmit. From the point of view of those, however, who do not have a distinctive culture, a very legitimate question might be whether education without dogma, education for aspiration in the direction of the ideal life, could not be carried on in the democratic public schools of our great country. And if it could, in other words, if the public school can develop on the part of our children aspirations in the direction of the ideal, what then shall be the function of those who are engaged specifically in religious education but who do not have a unique culture to transmit? This problem, per-

haps, deserves special consideration at some future convention of the Association.

Mrs. Sophia Lyon Fahs:*

The practical aspects of such a creative process as that described by Dr. Hartshorne were discussed by the third speaker, Mrs. Sophia Lyon Fahs, and illustrated out of her own experiences with children. The following résumé represents her major theses.

Whatever a teacher's philosophy of religion may be, it should be possible for him to lead children and young people in such a way as to bring about the development of creative relationships.

Those who cling to the traditional forms of Christianity as authoritarian doctrines and who attempt so to teach them to children must realize the force of Dr. Hartshorne's statement that traditional Christianity is an anachronism in our modern and scientific society. An experience with a fifth grade class during the past year impressed upon Mrs. Fahs the truth of Dr. Hartshorne's statement. Because of the children's contact with a Catholic group, and because of the many questions which this contact evoked, and in order to give the children a richer background from which to look at their own questions, Mrs. Fahs told them the old story of salvation in its entirety, including the fall of Satan and of man, the coming of a succession of deliverers culminating in Christ to save mankind from destruction, the rejection of Christ, his resurrection, his second coming, the thousand-year reign of God on the earth, the final judgment and the separation of the good and bad in heaven and hell. The story was told objectively with sufficient attention to the dramatic movement to require four or five hours in the telling.

The attitudes toward the story expressed by different members of the class

were impressive, suggesting clearly the conflicting concepts to which the children had been exposed. Some, for example, assumed that the story *must* be true, but wondered how it had been proved. Some wished that it *might* be true but could scarcely see how it could be true. Others *hoped* that it could not be true, for they reacted against the kind of God pictured. They were not sure they really wished to live forever, especially if it meant living in the kind of heaven described, and they felt a sympathy for mankind and even for Satan when dealt with by so arbitrary and cruel a God. Finally, there were those who were *sure* that the story could not be true, except in parts, for it seemed to them to be unreasonable. They said, "We simply can't believe it."

One element then to be encouraged if creative relationships are to be established between teachers and children is the giving of opportunities to children, in an atmosphere of frankness, to compare differing thoughts and points of view. Our programs of religious education have been too narrowly Christian and Jewish, and too Biblically centered. Christians have exalted Jesus on such a lonely pedestal that he cannot be adequately appreciated. It seems important, even in dealing with children at an early age when they are first introduced to the history of mankind's achievements, to let them see differing ways men have had of imaging God, and differing concepts of the good life. We have made the mistake, to which Dr. Hartshorne referred, of giving children the flowers and fruits of our religion before giving them an opportunity to develop the seeds within themselves and to grow their own roots in the soil of their own experiences.

Such a process means something strikingly different from the propagation even of the best religion that we can conceive of. In a conference recently, Professor William H. Kilpatrick was asked if we were not justified in propagating Christianity because in so doing we were striving to develop people governed by the

*Lecturer on Religious Education at Union Theological Seminary, Superintendent of the Junior Department at Riverside Church, New York City, and Editor of Children's Materials for the American Unitarian Association.

highest ideals of which we can conceive. Professor Kilpatrick, however, replied in the negative, because, he said that by not giving children and young people the opportunity to work out their positions for themselves, we were not showing the respect due to them and we were making impossible for them the development of something essential in Christian character, namely a development of their own inner resources.

In addition to so fundamental an element in the process as making available for children at an early age the data on which to build their own thinking, there are certain physical conditions that must be met for our work with children, if such a mutuality of relationship is to become possible. For instance, we need an atmosphere where quiet can at times be secured. We need space so that a variety of activities may be engaged in. We need equipment and tools so that expression in various art forms can be encouraged. We also need more time than the usual Sunday school plans for. A three-hour session on Sundays seems increasingly important.

Again, if activities are to emerge in the creation of things worthwhile, there must be a consciousness of worthwhile problems to be solved and shared purposes to solve them. We have made slow progress in discovering genuinely interesting and worthwhile things which boys and girls may do together.

Mutuality of relationship must be based also upon an understanding between grown-ups and children. Through the study of mental hygiene and of psychology in general, we need to discern more discriminatingly the types of relationship which can result in a richer development of personalities. It is not enough to talk in terms of loving one another. Often when we seem to be loving the most, we are loving the least. When we are dominating or possessive in our love, we are not really treating children as persons.

Finally, we need to learn how to guide children in building their faith and life

upon their own experiences with the universe rather than upon indoctrination. We need to become conscious that something concerning God and something concerning our philosophy of life may emerge out of any experience. We may begin with anything and find God if he really is everywhere and we really dig deep enough or think greatly enough.

Such an approach, however, means a revolution in our usual introduction of children to religion. It requires that we shall delay instruction regarding God and Jesus and prayer until children are able to do their own thinking. To give them instruction in doctrine before they have the basis in experience stunts rather than develops growth. Instead of giving children theological concepts, we need to help them to live richly the experiences natural in their situations. In due time, the children will see the religious implications for themselves with a minimum of verbal instruction.

In the preparation of a course to be published by the Beacon Press of Boston for use by church school teachers of children from three to five years of age, activities have been selected and stories written on the basis of an analysis of the natural experiences of children of those years. Those experiences have been chosen for accent which seem to have in them what may be called the germs of religious experiences. Suggestions are given to teachers and parents to help them to deal with these situations with appreciation and yet with a minimum of theological instruction.

The following are some of the types of experience which it is believed little children may naturally have that have imbedded in them religious implications and possibilities:

1. Experiences with the forces of nature, such as rain, snow and wind.
2. Experiences when children are first challenged by the difference between animate and inanimate things.
3. Experiences when children discover that living things are born and die.

4. Experiences with sickness.
5. Experiences with the world of dreams and fancies in contrast to the world of conscious experience when awake. In such experiences lies the possibility of the discovery that the mind is able in part to transcend the limitations of the body.
6. Experiences in social cooperation in the family circle and in the larger community through which children achieve a sense of their own worth in relation to others.
7. Experiences in which children achieve through their own purposing and original planning something that seems to them worth while.
8. Experiences in which children choose between two or more types of activity on the basis of their relative worth and experiences in which they postpone the achieving of a lesser good for the sake of achieving later a greater good.

Open Discussion: *

The open discussion which followed was at first centered around questions of theology and their implications for religious education, but by general consent these questions were postponed until the next day. The discussion then centered on the practical aspects of a creative process for growth in religion, particularly as these had been suggested by Mrs. Fahs.

Mr. Herman Wornom of Union Theological Seminary raised a question as to what was to be done about the child's sense of evil in his own disposition. He quoted a boy as saying you never can get rid of this spirit of evil, but you can keep it down. Dr. Hartshorne thought that the degree of significance it had for a child depended upon the way it was dealt with in the culture. Mrs. Dorothy D. Barbour of Cincinnati, a former missionary, doubted if this was found natu-

ally in the child. She thought Chinese children did not have it.

Rev. Victor E. Marriott of the Congregational Education Society of Chicago asked whether certain norms were recognized in this process with which we start children. We do not expect, do we, that the child will have to go over the whole experience of the race again? Mrs. Fahs replied that the norms are in the culture and that one cannot be a parent without accepting the results of certain norms; but that we do need to try to help the child to have a chance to begin with the beginning and learn through his own experience the value of cooperative doing rather than just to present norms to him. Mrs. Barbour said the norms are found in the experience and we do weigh the experience so that it is recognized that love is better than hate and truth better than falsehood. Mrs. Fahs emphasized the desirability of not trying to verbalize these too early. She was afraid of verbalized teaching of these to children of three or four or five. There is a time, when the child is mature enough, when she naturally would share these norms.

Mr. Israel Chipkin of the Jewish Education Association raised a question in regard to the concept of religious as applied to this growth of experience in children. To what extent is the sense of the difference between good and evil moral, and to what extent religious? At what point, also, does a particular cultural pattern begin to function? Is there any room, for example, for a Christian pattern as compared with a Buddhist? Mrs. Fahs replied that the distinction between moral and religious was not one that bothered her. Any choice where the better is chosen over one that is not so good might be called a religious choice; it might be called a moral choice, if we preferred that term. If by moral is meant a sense of sin, she prefers not to use the word. With reference to Mr. Wornom's question about a sense of evil, she continued, children are better off, according to the findings of mental hygiene, if they are not given a

*Reports of the open discussions were prepared from notes taken by the chairman, Professor Harrison Elliott, and by four graduate students at Oberlin School of Theology, Messrs. John Hamlin, Francis Hutchinson, M. J. Philippi, and Miss Bertha Juel.

sense of sin. Children are so easily overburdened by it. It is more wholesome to decide the issues of everyday life on the basis of the consequences of action rather than with reference to parents' attitudes or God's attitude. The child is so tightly bound to us emotionally that he feels he must keep close to us, but we can lighten that burden by the sense of security he has regardless of what he does. It is contrary to the best data we have to assume that the child is essentially evil. This sense of evil is given to him in the culture, and often wrongly so.

Rabbi Leon Fram of Detroit noted that God is not mentioned in the lower range of the text series and asked when it is that God begins to be mentioned. He said that he believed it was important to teach children early forms of prayer—kneeling, bowing the head, closing the eyes—otherwise it may be too late. Professor Ernest J. Chave of the University of Chicago Divinity School added that he was interested that Mrs. Fahs does not feel any need in the nursery school to employ the term "God." Are we consistent with other education, he inquired, when we keep the term God out of all early religious education? Why can not the term God be introduced with the idea of reconstructing it as the child grows? A child does not understand the term "sky," but he uses it, and so with other terms which he can reconstruct as he grows older.

Rabbi Isaac Landman of Temple Beth Elohim, Brooklyn, New York, said he thought it was not possible to protect a child from knowing the term. The question, then, is whether or not he will have some concept that the teacher or parent wants him to have or obtain an interpretation of religion which some outsider has. Mrs. Muriel Curtis of Wellesley College said there was danger of his knowing the term only as a curse word. Rev. C. Ivar Hellstrom, Minister of Religious Education at the Riverside Church, New York City, replied that no one assumes the world is a vacuum. But we do not feel at Riverside Church we must dump these

patterns and words upon the child. Someone who is close to the child should make the explanations. We try to fit parents to do it. We take the children into the church, but we do not raise all the theological problems. They regard it as their church.

Rev. Ernest Kuebler, Secretary for Religious Education of the American Unitarian Association, reported an experiment of Mrs. Fahs' with twelve year old children on an island off the New England coast. There they studied marine life, but the children did not ask questions as to who made this until the fourth or fifth session, after they already had a feeling of the wonder of creation. Then it was possible to interpret God more meaningfully.

Mrs. Fahs added that her own point of view had grown out of her experience with children. There are many difficulties in first introducing little children to these large concepts. Why should we expect that we could present the meaning of God to a four year old child? Usually the result of talking about God to a four year old child, or even a six year old, is a conception not really helpful. When should we do it? We don't know. We must carry on a great deal more experimenting than we have done. Because terms are used in the adult world is not an excuse for putting them into our Sunday school program. We should deal with these terms when the child meets them in experience, and then not in a manner which binds him emotionally. If you instruct a little child about God or teach him to pray you are in danger of tying him emotionally to a conception which he will not with ease revise. Prayer is not a habit. The external manner is of no importance. Prayer has to do with the spirit. You are not really teaching little children to pray, and to teach them to say prayers has no gain.

Mrs. Muriel Curtis reported the experience of a child with a cocoon who voluntarily wanted to say her prayers. Mrs. Barbour felt that we should share with the child that which we have found best and

thus challenge him. Mr. Wornom felt that the terms "sky" and "God" are abstract, but that love is concrete. It is with the objective things in the environment, to which the child is related, that we should deal. Dr. Hartshorne commented that one of our difficulties grows out of the fact that we conceive of our religion in too abstract terms. This makes it difficult to share religion with children. If we could simplify what religion essentially means, then we would find a way of sharing it. God then might mean to us what it might also mean to a child. As we now use the term, it does not mean anything that the child can comprehend. This is unfortunate. There is much in the child's experience from which an adult can learn. If we watched what happens when the child does not do obeisance, we might discover new meanings which could be shared. Mr. Wornom thought this would involve providing a controlled group, in which the child was isolated from his culture, and asked how such a group could be secured. Dr. Hartshorne replied in the negative, but said it would mean adding other items to whatever cultural experience he has.

Dr. Gamoran reported that in his family they did not teach their children to pray, but to recite prayers. His six-and-a-half year old asked a question about God one day at the table, when a number of guests were present. The reply was: God is all the beautiful things in the world: the beautiful trees and the lovely rivers and your little brother when he laughs and you when you come at once when mother calls you. How are we going to observe religious experience in children? What we see is the influence of our traditional conceptions of deity, an anthropomorphic idea about God, the tyrant of the universe. As to norms, we need not be hesitant about using some of our norms, if they are satisfying to us. But we ought not to try to use the traditional norms. If a conception does not function for me, why should I try to impose that conception either consciously or unconsciously upon my children? That God will occur in the

environment goes without saying. When the opportunity presents itself I can answer the child's questions in the light of my own experience. The child who at the table asked who is God, five years later asked: How did it all begin? I should like to present a thesis in regard to religious experience, as a basis for measuring this experience in children. Religious experience takes place when human beings react to each other in relation to some question in which aspiration to higher ideals takes place and in which one or both are moved to go to something higher than they have gone before.

The chairman, Professor Elliott, summarized the discussion. He said that the discussion had been concerned with the problem of providing little children with the opportunity of creative types of religious experience. It has been suggested that care must be exercised in determining when the concepts of religion can be constructively introduced. Mrs. Fahs and some of the others have indicated that terms like God are too difficult for the little child and to introduce them early with emotional associations may make it difficult for these to be reconstructed later. Others have felt that it is not possible to avoid these terms and that early instruction is important. Several constructive suggestions have been made: first, that these questions should be answered as they arise in experience and by individuals close to the child, such as parents; second, that the answers should be in the form of testimony out of experience and that care should be taken so that the answers are not emotionally reinforced in such a way as to make revision of the conceptions difficult; third, that adults should expect to learn out of this experience with little children.

Professor Chave asked: Are we considering enough the nature of the child and too much the nature of the culture? As the child matures, he has a growing capacity for a sense of relationship. He gains increased skill in all of his adjustments and in the capacity to put things

together in a way to integrate his experience. His religion is to be constructed as an integrating experience. We should take more account of these growing capacities for appreciation and for a sense of relationship. Are we considering enough the nature of the child himself and are we considering too much the nature of the culture?

Mrs. Barbour objected to thinking of religion as concept and emphasized the importance of attitudes or emotions. It is devotion to God which is wanted. We want children to become interested in certain changes in society where those who have less opportunity are unjustly treated. The problem is how we are to get these attitudes. Rabbi Landman remarked that Dr. Gamoran's was an unusual case and that not many could work out the problem as Dr. Gamoran had. In his own case, he said, he had with his two sons and a daughter followed a very obvious method of education. The God idea was taken for granted and they were sent to Sunday school from the beginning. He emphasized the importance of the problems of adolescent boys and girls which he said were the same as those of adults. In our curricula of instruction we should provide at the proper time opportunity for discussion of the time-old problems: of How, Why, and Where. How did religion begin? Man as an ethical and social being; immortality; organized religion. There should be opportunity for frank discussion so they can withstand anti-religious influences. Mr. Charles Aznakian of Union Theological Seminary underlined an earlier point that often childhood explanations of God last through into adolescence and are injurious.

After a brief intermission, the discussion was opened by Mrs. Curtis who raised the question of freedom for children. Do we let them be as free as we think we are? Could anyone, for example, give children the story of Salvation without giving them a conditioned account. However much one wanted to be open-minded and tolerant, would not the account almost in-

evitably be given from a point of view? Had the story been given by someone more heartily in sympathy, might not the reaction of the children have been different? She gave the illustration of a group who had decided to be tolerant and go where the facts led them, to which one member of the group replied: "You think you haven't already made a choice, do you? You certainly have by deciding to be open-minded." Isn't a certain amount of conditioning of children inevitable and desirable; at least conditioning to Jesus' way of life and service? In achieving that aim, are we depriving children of power to choose? Are we not, perhaps, in trying to impress children with the fact that they are completely free and that they have the problem of working out their own ideas of God, are we not depriving them of an essential basic experience? We ourselves are anchored to something; do we not owe it to our children to share this with them?

Professor William C. Bower of the University of Chicago Divinity School followed up Mrs. Curtis' point by objecting to any tendency to discuss the child as an isolated human being. There seems to be an idea of a human being that is to some extent disassociated from the culture with a particularly strong feeling that it is our business further to free him from the contradictions of his culture. We must recognize the actual relation of any living being to the culture within which his life comes into being, through which he is nourished and in and through which he must achieve for himself such individual freedom as he may achieve. Does not our psychological insight lead us to a particularly clear recognition that what he develops is due to his social interaction with his social group? If we succeed in freeing an individual from his tradition, does he not have a new problem which gets out of hand rather more rapidly than he can manage it? If we secure a radical degree of freedom through ideas that do not function in his culture, we haven't been of any particular help but

have instead done him a disservice. Freedom must be achieved within the moving stream of attitudes and habits of the cultural group. There needs to be sensitivity, self-criticism, openness at the growing end, but never severing the individuals from their genetic ideas. We may not approve it; but it is his culture. It may be enriched or revised as he develops new insight. Is not one of the things that is giving our major cultural problem and our major individual distortion that we have been set free from a culture in which ideas function with some degree of coherence and we find ourselves broken loose, lost because we have broken with culture?

Dr. Gamoran also emphasized that freedom had to take place within the culture. The Roman Catholics are right in a sense in indoctrinating children in the accepted religion and culture. A choice has been made when the decision is made to be open-minded. It is at least a kind of choice which permits alternatives to be considered, whereas to choose the opposite is to choose a point of view and to rule out alternatives. Between the two extremes, there is a certain amount of attitude-taking on the part of leaders. If we are democratic in our attitude we are ruling out autocracy.

Mr. Hellstrom said that he felt Professor Bower's emphasis upon culture seemed to imply an excessive simplicity which did not seem to exist. Every individual is brought up in the midst of a variety of culture patterns that are inconsistent with each other. Does not that fact have to be recognized? Professor Bower replied that Mr. Hellstrom adds a point which he would want to stress. He said he meant by culture the complex of all these processes which one identifies as the total life of the group. These cultures within the larger culture have in them just the tensions which Mr. Hellstrom mentions. The function of education is to raise these tensions into attention, to get reflection upon them, in perfectly normal situations. It is to help the immature members along

with ourselves to make judgments about attitudes. If there are no conflicts, then the individual is lost in the culture as seems to be true of primitive life. But it is still true that this education moves within the stream of the cultural process, and the attempt is not to educate an individual as an isolated human being but an individual that is a participant in a long-time evolving culture which contains within it these tensions which carry the possibility of more adequate ways of thinking and of handling the situations we face. Mr. Hellstrom said that it is not merely a comparison of ideas, but the actuality of being a part of some kind of a fellowship.

Miss Rhoda McCulloch of the National Board of Young Women's Christian Associations said that the culture may be bad, and therefore we may need to cultivate revolt against it. Further the constituency of the group is important. It is a highly selected group with which the church deals. This process cannot be carried on most effectively unless people within the groups represent the high points of the various cultures within any community. In other words, if there is to be adequate ground for the experience, there will need to be within the group a wide assortment of the outstanding elements of the community and mutuality between these elements.

Mr. Wornom said that culture had growing points in opposite directions. Professor Bower replied that choices were inevitable. The only question is how radical the choice will be. If the possibilities are diametrically opposite, it may have to be a radical choice. It is just at these points of divergence where creativity takes place. Dr. Hartshorne said that the ground for such choice is important. Choices may be made on the basis of that given in the tradition or of what can be discovered to be truth through the scientific method. An experimental culture includes within itself the possibilities of change. The question is whether we can get children into the atmosphere of such

a democratic and experimental culture.

Professor Bower commented that the ground for the choices was partly in the light of tradition, partly in the light of possibilities of change through the use of methods of analysis and appraisal. Dr. Hartshorne replied that in a democratic process, the common judgment of mankind as embodied in history and tradition was not accepted as authority save for the purpose of carrying on and conducting an experiment. But the traditional culture does not admit that idea. Here is the difference between the democratic and the authoritative point of view. In the democratic we do not accept the tradition just because it came down from our fathers. We say we are going to investigate these things. The question is: Can we democratize religion? If so, we reject authority as the last word. Then the question becomes, how we can give children freedom to make choices in a democratic religion and what is the ground of security in a democratic religion.

Professor Chave emphasized the importance of the end-point in the process. What is this creative responsibility for? The furtherance of personality expression? Mutuality? Is the end-point the qualities of these persons and their capacity for growth? Along what lines of growth? When do we know there is satisfactory growth? Some patterns change. How do we know whether the change is good or bad? Is the norm in the characteristics of the person or in the growth? What is the quality of personality we are looking for? What do we consider to be the possibilities for growth?

Professor Bower challenged the idea that the end-point of religious education is the development of persons. Person is unthinkable apart from his culture, and culture is unthinkable and impossible apart from collective behavior and the association of persons. Both must go on in reciprocal relations. Professor Chave said that if in contrast with a mechanistic

world with simple adjustment to the parts of the world, personality is this self-conscious quality of the world and the individual person is one unit in that development of self-consciousness, it will give a different meaning to culture and to the process in which we are engaged. If there are self-conscious beings who can differentiate in their actions, and if they are related to a world in which there is possibility of choice in every movement, then progress of events takes place when these self-conscious beings relate themselves to the self-consciousness of the universe, not in a fixed culture, but in a culture which is capable of growth in several directions and among individuals who are capable of growth in several directions. Religion achieves its end when persons widen the gap between animal or mechanistic choices to those self-conscious choices which are related to a consciousness of a world which has in it many forms of growth. The fundamental thing is the quality of persons and their choices. This is in agreement with what religion has been for centuries. Man has tried to discover the way the world works, to understand it and to utilize it more and more. Religion is achieving itself as persons have been trying to find themselves in a world where they are not the victims of the world but operate in relationship to the capacities of the world. Religion begins for the child when he finds within himself capacity to manage life and when he knows there are various possibilities, that he can make choices and form standards. The culture influences a child. Totalitarian culture presents to a child a limited set of experiences to which he can react. A democratic culture gives everyone as wide a range as is possible within that culture.

The chairman, Professor Elliott, in closing the discussion for the day, commented that the question still had not been answered—how to keep the child in contact with the culture and yet give him freedom for growth.

POINTS OF TENSION BETWEEN PROGRESSIVE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION AND CURRENT THEOLOGICAL TRENDS*

WILLIAM CLAYTON BOWER**

IN a pre-conference outline I submitted a series of eight propositions in regard to tensions that have arisen between progressive religious education and current theological and social trends, with questions intended to stimulate thinking in regard to the issues involved. In this presentation I undertake to make a constructive statement of my own position on the issues raised, as a basis for discussion.

Since within the limits of this presentation it is not possible to devote a differential treatment to the several current theological trends, I am selecting the more extreme form of the neo-supernaturalistic movement and the position of Barth in order to sharpen the fundamental issue and render it manageable within the space at our disposal.

It may be said that progressive religious education in its intellectual orientation, its basic conceptions concerning the nature of reality and man, and its procedures, rests upon the assumptions of empirical and experimental thought.

Liberalism as one of the major expressions of the empirical and experimental method is no mere intellectual vagary. It is a complex and massive intellectual and social process moving in an orbit of seven centuries. In its modern phase it had its origin in the Renaissance of the thirteenth century. It was, in its essential character, a reaction from the unity, the metaphysical systems, the authority, and the other-worldliness of the Middle Ages. It was a reaction in the di-

rection of values which the Middle Ages had denied—individual freedom, the worth of present experience, the world of nature, and the inner life of man. It affirmed man's competence to understand the processes of nature, of which he is a part, and, by introducing intelligence and purpose, to control, within limits, his own experience in terms of its possibilities.

As a movement, it has undergone continuous change and development and has had many interpreters. Its methods have become more refined and precise. Their most successful applications thus far have been in the fields of the physical sciences and technology. More recently considerable progress has been made in their application to human behavior, both personal and social. It would appear that the next and most significant achievements of the scientific method will be in the field of human relations.

It is because progressive religious education is committed whole-heartedly to the procedures of empirical thought that it has felt the need of coming to an understanding of the nature and function of religion through objective, scientific research. Through this objectification the religious educator has come to see religion as a phase of man's interaction with his total world.

This is how it has become possible for him to distinguish between the function which religion fulfils in human experience and the concepts, techniques, and social structures with which the function is implemented. This is why the religious educator tends to turn to anthropology, history, and psychology for an understanding of religion, rather than to theology. He views theology as a rationalization of religious experience—a datum to be accounted for rather than a basis for

*A paper read Tuesday morning, April 25, 1939, before the Oberlin Convention of the Religious Education Association. The vigorous discussion which followed the reading of the paper is summarized by Professor Harrison S. Elliott on pages 172-181.

**Professor of Religious Education, Divinity School, University of Chicago.

explanation. For this reason the religious educator has given much attention to epistemology and axiology. He is not, however, merely interested in the nature of knowledge and a theory of values, but in the functioning of knowledge and values in personal and social living.

For some time we have been in the midst of a profound reaction against liberalism in the direction of traditional and authoritative modes of thought and life. As it would be a grave error to oversimplify an account of liberalism as a mode of the modern mind, so it would be an equally grave error to oversimplify an account of the current mood of reaction. As I have pointed out in recent issues of the *JOURNAL*, it, too, is a large-scale and deep-moving intellectual and social movement. It affects not only theology, but philosophy, education, and the organization of the state. Even so noble an ideal as ecumenicity, when viewed abstractly, is dominated by a continental theology that further accentuates the medieval elements in a Protestantism already dominantly Catholic in its inherited theology.

The current reaction is to a large extent motivated by a wistful search for values that seem to be present in medieval thought and life but which liberalism has not provided. Liberalism has won its values of freedom, initiative, and creativity, but at the expense of security, unity, and a convincing sense of the meaning and worth of life. Freedom has ripened into license, neglect of the interrelatedness of our experience has delivered us into atomism. In the face of brilliant technological achievement we are confronted by a social situation of world proportions that for the moment is out of hand. We have to a large degree lost our sense of direction and of the ends that lend dignity to the human scene. We have not yet learned to live in a world of relative values rather than absolutes.

There can be no doubt that the mood of reaction is accentuated by the tragedy of the World War and the post-war depression. At the moment we are under

the stress of imminent world catastrophe rapidly moving toward a crisis that possibly can be resolved only by the collapse of the totalitarian states or a decision of arms. We are suffering from extreme emotional fatigue. We seem to be in the grip of profound, complex, and massive forces that operate in the depths of the social process—forces that are deep, elemental, and irrational.

In the presence of such situations of extreme frustration, there are three characteristic types of reaction. One is that of defeatism which surrenders in the presence of the problem and lapses into cynical pessimism and skepticism. Another is to escape from the problem by retreat into the illusory securities of supernaturalism and apocalypticism. Another is to face the problem realistically and to seek its solution with the aid of such resources of intelligence and values as we possess, in the undaunted conviction that the way out is forward through a more radical application of the empirical and experimental method than we have thus far seen. This is the choice of the liberal.

To the liberal such periods of conflict and frustration furnish the known conditions for reflective thinking as well as for the re-examination of our inherited and operative values. Historically, such periods have been those of the most significant cultural advance. It is my conviction that we are participants in such a period in which a creative outcome is possible. In our generation culture is being reborn, and, with it, religion. I am convinced that our successors will look back upon this era as one of the most creative in the history of culture. But it will be so only if we grapple with the issues in terms of stern and even tragic realism and with such insights and disciplined intelligence as we may derive from the funded experience of our cultural past.

Here, then, on a wide canvas and with a few bold strokes, is a rough picture of the religious, intellectual, and political

situation of our contemporary world. It is a picture of an uneven line drawn across the cultural map of the Western World. On either side of this line are ideologies and sets of values that appear to be irreconcilable and mutually exclusive. Along the various sectors of that line—intellectual, religious, educational and political—the major cultural conflict of our time is taking place. Upon its issue depends the future of civilization for some centuries to come.

It is in these areas of conflict that sharp tensions have arisen between progressive religious education and current regressive theological and social trends.

The most fundamental of these tensions arises out of conflicting conceptions of the nature and structure of reality. Three of the most influential concepts concerning the nature of reality that have emerged out of the empirical and experimental approach are those of continuity, process, and prediction as a basis of control. These concepts have profound metaphysical implications as well as far-reaching consequences for a philosophy of education and programs of social action. The insights that have arisen within the range of our experience indicate that reality presents dependable uniformities of behavior, reducible to mathematical probability. Upon these uniformities are erected all the sciences. It is out of the extension of this generalization through imagination and hypothesis that the modern mind has arrived at the conception of *a universe*.

But the more recent insights of science indicate that reality is not a static mechanism with recurrent behaviors in fixed and predetermined patterns. Rather, it is a *process* in which continuity is inseparably united with change. It would be better to say that the reality of empirical experience is an organization of innumerable processes interacting with each other in such a way as to constitute a complex but consistent whole. In this whole some processes are emergent while others are recessive. It is significant that to his earlier

daring formula of relativity Einstein has recently added a formula for the unity of a relativistic universe.

Upon the concepts of continuity and process, the modern mind has erected the crowning concept of predictability, together with the concomitant idea that it is possible, within limits, to control the processes of reality by rearranging the factors operative in these processes. The limits of human predictability and control are set in part by man's understanding and capacity, on the one hand, and by the emergent elements in the process, on the other. Notwithstanding these limitations, however, man has achieved an increasing degree of prediction and control in the various areas of his experience. It is upon this concept that man's brilliant successes in the field of technology are based as well as in the field of medicine and, to an increasing degree, in the organization of personal and social behavior.

The effect of these concepts has been a re-orientation of the modern mind from the past to the present and the future, and from living by precedent to an attempt to improve life in terms of its possibilities. It is as though we had crossed an intellectual continental divide where the waters run in another direction to another sea.

Now the current theological reaction would revive a pre-scientific and primitive concept of the nature and structure of reality. According to such a view reality is cleft asunder into two disparate and mutually exclusive orders of existence—the natural and the supernatural. Matter is set over against spirit, as activity is set over against intelligence. Nature is degraded. The home of reason is in the realm of abstract forms. The dichotomy is not only intellectual; it is ethical. The world of practical experience is under demonic control.

From this concept of a cleft reality arise characteristic concepts of God, man, knowledge, and nature. God becomes wholly transcendent, the totally other, who, as Absolute, acknowledges

no responsibility for his acts other than to himself as a pre-existent, all-sufficient, and sovereign authority. His relations with man and nature are only at the points where the eternal breaks through into the temporal order in cataclysmic and miraculous fashion. Over against this transcendent God man is set in a tragic existence. The incompetence of his intelligence and moral purpose is due not only to his degraded creaturely status, but to the diffusion of mortal sin resulting from the fall. He is incompetent to do anything about his undone estate—not even to initiate a moral purpose. He can only suffer and wait for God's election and redemption through an act of supernatural grace.

It follows that man's capacity for knowledge is narrowly limited. Beyond these narrow limits man is dependent for knowledge upon supernatural revelation made available through uncritical faith. The function of man's rational powers is concerned with the systematization of data furnished by revelation. Reason is not concerned with the discovery or validation of the content of revelation. This is given and is beyond the verification of human intelligence. The psychologists have a word for this.

Certain consequences follow from this throwback to primitive modes of thought that place it in violent conflict with modern religious education. It would dissolve the unity that is emerging through perceived interrelations of experience into utter and irrational chaos in which God, nature, and man are completely isolated from each other. The metaphysical unity it seeks is a specious unity resulting from the imposition of an abstract and unverifiable system of *a priori* ideas upon reality and the substitution of these ideas for reality. It would throw a dynamic and creative process back into static and rigid forms that permit no conscious and intentional attempt at improvement. By isolating man from nature and God from both it would render unavailable the known condition of in-

teraction through which God, nature, and man achieve self-realization and fulfillment. It would surrender such guarantees of objectivity as are possible through man's interaction with his objective world and plunge him into a radical subjectivity in which rationalization is substituted for critical thought. In short, were such a regression widely to prevail, it would render religious education in any creative sense impossible in the name of a wholly transcendent God. Religious education in the totalitarian church that would result from such a theology would become what it has become in the totalitarian state—indoctrination, coercion, and propaganda.

A second tension arises in the area of the relation of creativity, upon which progressive religious education places great emphasis, and tradition, upon which reaction places its great emphasis. Creative religious education is oriented toward the present as the growing-point of religion and culture. Without neglecting the continuity of the present with the past, it is chiefly concerned with those elements of change where new directions are being taken and where the possibilities that reside in the process appear.

Creativity consists in part in discovering and developing the possibilities that are resident in a given situation. It consists in part in the discovery of emergent elements in the situation and in relating the possibilities of the given situation to the new emergents.

Creative religious education thinks in terms of trends, and by seizing upon the factors that are operative in these trends seeks to bring them under the control of intelligence and purpose directed toward foreseen ends. The current reaction places an unprecedented emphasis upon history. It insists that the present shall be dominated by the past. Creative religious education, on the other hand, insists that the present shall be dominated by the possibilities that reside in the present and that the funded experience of the past shall be used for

furthering those possibilities.

This tension, to be sure, inheres in the cultural process itself. But it is not an insoluble problem. It is only insoluble when the creative aspects of culture and tradition are set in radical opposition to each other. The past, the present, and the future are bound inseparably in the cultural process where continuity and change meet in the forward-moving reality—the only reality—which is the present. It is here that culture is recreated. By placing the supreme emphasis upon tradition, theological reaction renders the problem insoluble.

The issue that lies at the heart of this tension raises the whole question as to the nature and end of religious education. Those whose thinking is dominated by precedent, tradition, and authority assume that it is the function of religious education to recover and transmit the tradition of the church, rationalized as supernaturally revealed truth once for all delivered to the saints. Those who hold to the ideals of creative religious education are convinced that it is the function of religious education to assist growing persons and groups to achieve a creative religious adjustment to the changing real and present world, with the resources that are available in the cumulative results of historical religious experience. Through such a functional utilization in the interpretation, evaluation, and redirection of current personal and social experience, tradition undergoes revaluation, selection, testing, and amplification.

To the creative religious educator the conflict between creativity and tradition is resolved in a synthesis of the two through the functional relation of historical and contemporary experience. Only in its functional use can there be a guarantee that a knowledge of history will not be substituted for vital religious living.

A third tension arises in the area of social action. In the light of the findings of social psychology, creative re-

ligious education is convinced that the self is the outgrowth of the interaction of the live human being with his objective world, physical and social. Society, in turn, is the outgrowth of the interaction of growing selves, mediated and patterned by the relations and functions involved in collective living. To think of the individual and of society in isolation from each other is to think of them abstractly and unrealistically. The individual realizes himself through participation in the processes of nature and of society. Society, in turn, is modified by the functioning in it of individuals. It is impossible, therefore, to hope for the improvement of persons without at the same time taking into account the improvement of society. This means that education is a social process and that social improvement is one of its most fundamental objectives.

Moreover, creative religious education finds it impossible to regard ideas as the ends of education. As it finds the beginning point of education in experience, so it sees education eventuating in the reconstruction of experience. The subject-matter of learning consists of actual situations moving toward resolution with the aid of the resources of historical knowledge, values, techniques, and institutions. It cannot, on any account, therefore, accept the Herbartian formula that education is the gradual adjustment of the immature to the traditions of culture. It affirms that education is a process of actual interaction with the present objective world of things and institutions with insight, discriminating judgment, disciplined purpose, and effective executive action.

It is out of considerations such as these that progressive education generally and creative religious education in particular have developed a profound sense of social function and responsibility. They bring to bear upon the inherited beliefs, standards, institutions, and processes of the *status quo* searching analysis and criticism in an effort to im-

prove them in the light of the highest values of historical and contemporary experience. Some form of social action is the inevitable outcome of creative religious education based upon such assumptions.

These ideals set creative religious education in radical conflict with the dominant conception of individual salvation as held by traditional theology. They also place it in conflict with the idea that man is incompetent to effect changes in the existing social order through the organization of his intelligence and purposes. They also place in complete opposition the educational method of functional religion and a free society as a mode of social action, on the one hand, and the methods of edict, propaganda, force, and revolution of a totalitarian church or state, on the other hand.

A fourth tension arises in the area of the relation of religion to culture. Holding as it does a functional view of religion, creative religious education conceives of religion as a phase of the total culture. It thinks of religion, at the level of experience, as a potential quality that attaches to any and every aspect of man's interaction with his objective world. Religion cannot, therefore, be an isolated and self-contained type of experience, paralleling other types of experience, such as economic activities, intellectual pursuits, political participation, leisure-time activities, or the creation and appreciation of beauty. As a quality, it has to do with every dimension of the person's or the group's experience. Only as it operates as the integrating center of all phases of the person's or the group's experience can religion be a vital and reconstructive factor in human living. When it migrates to the periphery of experience and becomes just another particular and isolated interest, it loses its quality as religion. It may, as history has so often demonstrated, even become one of the most disintegrating forces in culture.

Consequently, it is impossible for the

progressive religious educator to share wholly the fear and distrust which traditional religion exhibits toward the secularization of culture. It would assign as the chief reason for the widening chasm between traditional religion and current trends in culture, together with the much-lamented loss of the influence of religion upon that culture, the fact that traditional religion is no longer articulated with modern life. It is attempting to carry on its life and work with intellectual concepts, techniques, and institutions that arose out of and functioned in a culture that is forever past and are no longer relevant to or valid in the modern world. To a large extent the stream of modern culture has flowed around traditional and institutionalized religion. To this must be added the observation that many of the most spiritually significant movements are arising outside the church and in a considerable degree in antagonism to it. To set the church against the world only deepens the problem and renders it more insoluble.

For the first time in the modern world a functional view of religion makes it possible for religion to re-establish its articulation with culture and to bring to bear upon that culture its essential functions of criticism, reconstruction, and integration. Historically, the great creative periods in religion have been those, as in the case of the eighth century prophets, when religion dealt with the immediate and concrete issues of the economic, political, and social life of the people. Its sterile periods have been those in which the custodians of tradition withdrew into the sacred precincts of the temple and cathedral and occupied themselves with ancient theological and liturgical forms detached from the turbid stream of the experience of the common man.

This tension, like that arising out of the relation of creativity to tradition, inheres in the cultural process. On the one hand, the concepts, the techniques,

and the institutional structures of religion are derived from the supporting practical activities of the social group and are, therefore, subject to change in form and content. Its enduring values arise within the depths of the social experience. On the other hand, vital religion reacts upon the culture of a people as a factor of reconstruction. This it does by bringing to bear the cross-criticism of the values which it integrates upon every particular activity—economic, intellectual, political, aesthetic, and moral.

One of the deepest perennial problems of religion is how to participate in current culture and at the same time exercise its essential function of radical criticism and reconstruction. The Problem is one of the delicate and difficult balance between identification and objectivity—how to participate in culture and at the same time achieve a sufficient degree of objectivity to criticise it and seek to improve it. From the point of view of modern religious education the apparent conflict is resolvable in a higher functional synthesis, whereas the placing of religion over against culture renders the conflict permanently insoluble.

To state these tensions so sharply may raise in the minds of some the question as to whether, since reaction so strongly re-affirms tradition, the empirical movement and progressive religious education have not moved beyond the limits of historic Christianity.

If Christianity is thought of as a creative movement adapting its function to the ever-changing social situations of history, the answer is a decided negative. Upon reaction, by binding it to its concrete expressions of the past, rests the responsibility of denying the historic character of Christianity. In fact, one of the most fundamental choices we are called upon to make in the present period of cultural change is whether Christianity is to be for us a static and decaying historic movement or a dynamic

and creative movement whose resources and possibilities have not been exhausted by any historic period in its career.

By all accounts, we are going through a period of profound cultural change, in which we are passing out of one era into a new one. Will contemporary Christianity be able to do what historic Christianity has thus far done in every preceding period of social change? If it is so bound by its traditional thought-forms and institutional structures that it cannot achieve an effective articulation with the intellectual outlook, the values, and the social processes of the modern world, it would appear that Christianity is destined to become a passing historical phase of Western civilization. But if, on the other hand, Christianity, without breaking with its past, can be released from the bondage of that past so as to face creatively the possibilities of the present and the future, its era of greatest spiritual achievement may well lie in the future.

It is my personal conviction that Christianity as a vital influence in social life has a future that outruns any concrete embodiment in any historic period of its development thus far. But it cannot hope to exert a profound and creative influence upon the modern world by implementing its function with concepts, techniques, and institutional arrangements that were relevant and valid in a past culture but are alien to the intellectual, social, and spiritual climate of the modern world. It is also my personal conviction that the Christianity of the future will undergo profound changes—more profound than perhaps any of us have thus far dreamed. Only so can it remain a creative spiritual force on the field of an evolving human history.

In spite of these sharp tensions between progressive religious education and current theological and social trends, both liberalism and religious education have much to learn from the contemporary reaction. As was earlier pointed

out, in so far as liberalism was a reaction from the unity and authority of the Middle Ages, it was inevitable that its emphases should be extreme and that in its eagerness for the achievement of certain neglected values it should itself neglect in part values that had been achieved in medieval culture. Modern religious education undoubtedly shares in some of the limitations of liberalism, and may well be stimulated by the current reaction to make certain needed rectifications. I suggest six major areas in which such rectification might well be made.

First: Do not liberalism and modern religious education need to make more of the *beyondness* of experience than they have made? The first tendency of the empirical and experimental method has been to focus attention vividly upon the immediate scene. It is my own conviction that radical humanism has foreshortened our vision at the expense of the wider ranges of human experience. Our life on this planet is set in a cosmic context that extends from where we are into unimaginably vast distances of space-time. It is not quite sufficient to affirm that "earth is enough" when we reflect that the earth is caught up in a network of cosmic relations and that it has no existence apart from them. Human life is not in any realistic sense merely a planetary episode. Before the vast and inscrutable forces that enfold our earthly existence the human spirit may well bow in deep humility and awe. In the presence of these immeasurable processes and forces our egotism and our self-sufficiency disappear. This is the constructive idea in the concept of the supernatural. But the liberal cannot think of it as supernatural. It is the *beyondness* of the immediate and experienced, in a universe that is continuous from here to there.

As a result of this more recent mode of thought, the terms "natural" and "supernatural" are no longer realistic. In liberal thought God has as much to

do with known natural processes as with the as-yet-unknown. The traditional line separating the "natural" from the "supernatural" tends wholly to disappear. For a term for this newer concept that integrates the constructive elements of these outmoded types of thought into a new synthesis of reality into a continuous whole, we are greatly in need.

Second: Have liberalism and creative religious education had a sufficiently realistic sense of the deep tragedy of human experience? Has the vivid fixation of attention upon the immediate successes of a scientific and technological age blinded us in part to the limitations of our human capacities and to the frustrations and suffering that lie in the dark depths of our existence? Is there something of deep pathos in our tenuous hold upon life to which the age-old conception of sin corresponds and to which it gives expression? If so, how might this tragic note be expressed in terms other than those of the traditional theological concept of sin? And how may it be dealt with in the light of modern knowledge concerning the live human being in interaction with his world?

Third: Have liberalism and modern religious education placed a burden upon intelligence that human nature is not quite able to bear, seeing that it is our most recent acquisition? In our emphasis upon intelligence have we underestimated the much older and deeper strata of human nature—particularly the emotions and the irrational impulses? Have we made too much of knowledge at the expense or neglect of values? Here again, for the liberal it is not a matter of either-or. The solution would seem not to be a repudiation of intelligence and a return to the irrational elements of experience, but the bringing of intelligence and emotion and impulse into an integration of the whole self in which the emotions and impulses are disciplined by intelligence and intelligence is warmed by emotion.

Fourth: In its intense emphasis upon

the present, has modern religious education tended toward superficiality and triviality by neglecting a rich, full-bodied content of knowledge? Does it not need to recognize more than it has the continuity of the present with the past and to make creative use of the funded resources of the religious tradition? But this it must do through utilizing the tradition without substituting a knowledge of the past for a vital experience of life.

Fifth: Has modern religious education been too atomistic? Has not the time arrived when a search must be undertaken for the interrelations that bind our personal and social experience into wholes that are bearers of self-authenticated meaning and worth? If we who are liberal are not satisfied with the proposed restoration of metaphysics and theology as bases for such unities, what better solution have we to offer?

Sixth: In doing away with absolutes have liberalism and modern religious education sufficiently passed into the positive and affirmative phase of religious thought and life? Are we showing

people how to live securely with growing values and convictions that are able to evoke the whole-hearted devotion and commitment that characterized the older "age of faith?"

As one committed to the empirical and experimental method, I may close this presentation with the expression of the conviction that the time has arrived for liberalism to enter upon a new phase of its development as a mode of thought and life. This it will not do by a reaction to outmoded traditional thought-forms and life-patterns. Without relinquishing its hold upon the values of freedom, initiative, and creativity which it has won since the Renaissance, it will recognize the validity of values which were achieved after a fashion in the ancient past—security, synthesis, and discipline. But it will achieve these values in the setting of the modern world by moving forward to a more thoroughgoing application of the empirical and experimental method to the facts of our experience in a real and present world of things and men.

DISCUSSION ON PROFESSOR BOWER'S PAPER

THE chairman, Professor Elliott, opened the discussion period with a brief statement. He called attention to the fact that although the problem of theological issues was raised primarily in Professor Bower's paper, just read, the group on the previous day had been unable to postpone their discussion of theological points. Religious viewpoints are so integrally involved in every suggestion relating to conditions of growth in religion, that these inevitably arose in the previous day's discussion of Professor Hartshorne's paper. However, the Hartshorne paper was designed particularly to discuss the conditions for growth in religion; the Bower paper was designed to discuss the issues about religion itself

which have been raised by current theological trends.

The discussion of Professor Bower's paper was opened by presentations from three men who had had the paper in advance of the meeting. Dr. Stewart G. Cole of Chicago spoke first.

Dr. Stewart G. Cole: *

I wish to comment briefly on two problems that Professor Bower raises in his paper. The first refers to the conception of religion that is entertained by progressive religious educators and the difficulty of identifying it with the historic process of religion as the latter is sponsored by

*Executive Director, Service Bureau for Intercultural Education, New York.

Jews, Catholics and Protestants. How can these two views of religion be equated? Dr. Bower takes the position, one that most of us adopt, that the religious educator is concerned with the emergence of social values in human experience. These values, of whatsoever kind, source or quality, constitute the resources of religion. So long as they are positive values, raising the level of personality and cultural expression, they are to be regarded as evidences of the divine process operative within the human scene. This view breaks down the artificial distinction between the secular and the sacred and stresses the potential spiritual significance of all high-minded human endeavor.

Over against this functional view of religion, stand the historical faiths of Jews and Christians. The latter are articulate in terms of (a) institutions, (b) doctrinal formula, and (c) particular "ways of life" defined according to ethnic and social traditions. From this viewpoint religion is a localized interest in society; it has a distinctive pattern, and it lays stress upon particular values.

Here are two views of religion: the functional and the historico-cultural. The first disregards the limitations of sect, place, time, role, creed or race, as determining criteria of religious experience, and places sole emphasis upon the qualitative aspect of personal motivation and social behavior. The second conceives of religion in terms of loyalty to the mores, the symbols, the ideals, and the causes that the Romanist, the Jew, or the Protestant espouses. The first is inarticulate; the second articulate. As religious educators we advocate the former view, as persons we practice the latter. How can we bridge the gulf between these views of religion?

The other question pertains to Professor Bower's emphasis upon empiricism and values. He has indicated the signal service that modern science has made to the cause of liberalism. It has emancipated mind from dogma and set persons

free to explore truth in the physical and social worlds. The scientist is interested in the pursuit of factual information and such principles of law and order as may be deduced from a critical understanding of the facts. It would be difficult to overstate our debt of gratitude to science for its service to modern life.

At the same time the facts of science are not to be identified with values any more than the laboratory with the studio or science with art or religion. Here are two areas of human interest. While not absolutely separated, their relative difference is of paramount importance. The scientist's purpose is not that of the artist or religionist, nor vice versa. For one, facts are facts; and for the other, they may become values. The exponent of the empirical method seeks to escape the pitfall of subjectivity, to cultivate personal detachment for his problem of inquiry, and to set forth demonstrable evidence concerning the subject in hand. On the other hand, the artist or religionist seeks conditions of life that satisfy personal needs. A person becomes artist when he imputes to situations meanings that enrich his life and give a sense of completeness to experience. A fact becomes an esthetic value when it acquires the property of fulfilling a need of personality. It becomes a moral value when the need it satisfies is socially defined; and it takes on religious value when it bears a deeply spiritual meaning for the individual.

Dr. Bower's paper with its broad philosophic inquiries drives us back to reconsider the relation of science and religion, of fact and value; in brief, of a theory of values. Bertrand Russell says that ethics has no facts; it deals with values. One is prone to ask if religion as such has any facts? If not, what is the functional bearing of facts to values? How shall we relate more critically and systematically the methods of science and religion? The religious educator has not considered this problem with the care it calls for.

Professor Edward S. Ames: *

I am concerned particularly with the last point of Professor Bower's paper dealing with the need for the development of the implications of liberalism. It seems to me that this development should be made in several directions, but I am particularly interested in emphasizing certain conceptions of science. The term "liberalism" is used and misused in so many ways that it might be more serviceable for the purpose of this discussion if the word "empirical" or "experimental" were used.

The conception of science may be clarified by noting its history. Professor Whitehead in his book *Science and the World of Nature*, dwells on the seventeenth century as the "century of genius." The great names in various fields which he cites symbolize the epochal change in man's thought in that period. Since the great creeds of Christendom were formulated before that century, they might readily be characterized as pre-scientific. Perhaps four denominations, of which the Methodist is the largest, take their rise since the seventeenth century and may, therefore, be regarded as more integral with the scientific period though not always wholly of its spirit. A false conception of science is often stated by calling it materialistic and mechanistic. That was more true of the period dominated by the Newtonian physics. Present-day physics has adopted the conception of process and has radically modified the conception of basic elements, formerly called atoms. The new physics releases us from the strictly mechanistic conception. Whitehead, himself, is a representative authority in this new view. Another important fact about science is the need for recognizing its unity. The sciences themselves in their extreme specialization have been in larger part responsible for the impression of their separateness. Each deals with its own material and has its own vocabulary. In the textbooks the field of geology may appear

and sound very different from the field of physiology. The same is true of all particular sciences. But when the procedure of these different sciences is examined, it is apparent that they all proceed by a common method: observation of facts, classification, formulation of hypotheses, and further tests by observation and experimentation.

It is a significant fact that biblical scholars have utilized this scientific method in their development of what is known as higher criticism. All reputable seminaries accept science in this field which is so intimately religious. Even Barth and the theologians sympathetic with his views profess adherence to this scientific procedure applied to the most sensitive problems of religion. What is needed to dispel much of their confusion is to recognize that the method employed in biblical criticism is the same method as that of the physical and the social sciences. All these fields of science also tend to dispel the fallacy that *values* belong to a realm separate from *facts*.

It is important, also, to recognize that there are genuine religious attitudes in scientific procedure. George A. Coe in his *Religion of a Mature Mind*, stresses the fact that the scientist, by the nature of his procedure, cultivates faith, patience, courage, reverence, and imaginative ventures. The unselfishness and heroism of scientists such as Pasteur and Madame Curie cannot be over-emphasized.

The method of research and its consequences have also definite practical values which are genuinely religious. The revolutionary achievements of science on behalf of health (medicine, food (agriculture), transportation (Diesel engine), communication (radio), affect human life at its depths. They yield not merely physical benefits, but they transform man's feeling about life and about his relation to nature. They give new significance to the parable in which Jesus asserts that benefits of this kind rendered to human society are services to him!

This point of view in all the sciences

*Dean of the Disciples Divinity House, Chicago.

concerning man's relation to nature and the possibilities of creating a new world and a new society, is something new. It is so recent that it has not accumulated for itself the emotional conditioning which is needed in order to make it *feel* religious. The old view which made man's welfare depend upon the supernatural and upon revelation has had centuries in which to be wrought into vocabularies, liturgies, hymns and all forms of art. The new outlook upon the world which science affords is still in need of achieving these supports for religious use. This is an important part of the process of religious education in our time.

This general position is the basis upon which I have made the comment that religious education is now entering upon an epoch when it may very profitably recognize the fruitfulness of the scientific method in relation to the whole field of religious education, as the Religious Education Association at its beginning recognized the importance of the scientific method in biblical criticism. It was this fresh interest in biblical criticism which gave the R. E. A. its motivation and significance thirty years ago, and it is possible that the development of the sciences of man and nature may now open a still greater opportunity for religious education.

The resurgence of pre-scientific theologies today has obscured the religious value and possibilities of the scientific empirical view. It has led theologians to discredit "psychologism," "sociologism," and other sciences which deal with the nature of man and his inmost emotional experiences. Scientifically-minded religious people should be on their guard against the old dualism which insists on exalting the supernatural into mystical and dialectical terms and thereby discrediting the growing natural knowledge of the religious life which has possibilities of being far more fruitful for religious experience, and particularly for religious education. There is a possible continuity between practical matter-of-fact procedure and the

ideal or "spiritual" aspects of life. The commandments of the Old Testament had practical implications. Jesus, himself, did not speak about religion. He talked in terms of life and declared his mission to be a way of life and of life more abundant.

Professor Walter M. Horton: *

Dr. Bower has picked out the important points of tension and stated them with great clarity and fairness. He is correct in implying that if not resisted, the present theology reaction tends actually to destroy the whole basis of liberal culture on which the progressive religious education movement rests. It cannot, however, be successfully resisted by a stupidly reiterative liberalism, but only by one capable of appropriating the truth in the reaction and adjusting itself accordingly.

At a continental youth conference in Switzerland a number of years ago, I made a speech on Freedom. I discussed physiological freedom, which could be won only by physical exercise; psychological adjustment; political freedom; and finally freedom of the Christian man as set forth by Martin Luther. I indicated that freedom at each higher level was congruent with that at the preceding levels. One interpreter translated my speech into French, which made it seem to have great clarity, and another into German, which gave the impression of profoundness. But the reactions of my listeners in the discussion were devastating. The general tone of the reaction was this: What right have you to mention in the same breath the freedom of the Christian man discussed by Martin Luther along with physiological and psychological freedom? They do not belong in the same universe of discourse. I asked them what they would teach a child. Would they neglect how he should conduct himself physically? Would they give up any idea of a sound mind in a sound body? Their

*Professor, Oberlin Graduate School of Theology.

answers were very unsatisfactory. My youthful opponents at this conference were demanding of me that I expunge from the educational process everything natural and empirical and devote myself exclusively to what is in revelation. I am sure that the elements of the educational process must be preserved; but the delegates at this conference convinced me of something. Our purely empirical American way of relying upon the principle of continuity must be used with reservations. The path from scientific data, which can be so cleanly handled, to saving religious truth and reality is not a simple pathway, but a tortuous, and if you wish, a dialectical one. We have more to learn from the new orthodoxy than Professor Bower has suggested.

First, the new supernaturalism is not just a regression to a pre-scientific or primitive point of view. It is not pre-scientific but post-scientific. The members of this group accept science in this world, but they reassert supernaturalism. The character of the Beyond is discontinuous with that easily handled and easily predictable experience with which most of the sciences deal. The revelation of God in contemporary events has hit the supernaturalist. The war hit him. The post-war period hit him. He became aware of something which came down like a bolt of lightning; something that was different than would have been expected. There is a startling discontinuity which Barth says is characteristic of all periods of great cultural change. There is discontinuity between that which is below man, that which he can successfully master by his techniques, and that which is above him to which he must look up with reverence and by which he must be mastered.

Second, the new traditionalism does not necessarily substitute the knowledge of history for religious living. It does not necessarily mean the domination of the present by the past. Creativity results when something in tradition chimes in with the present need. Barth's *Romans*

is not irrelevant. It is not treated from a historical point of view. Barth treats it as if it had been written in the twentieth century. The traditional may cut in upon contemporary culture and criticize it precisely because it is in the tradition. Jewish education is able to be liberal precisely because it has never lost its connection with tradition. In the play, *The Eternal Road*, that which unrolled itself upon the upper stage, the Old Testament Story, and what happened on the lower stage, the modern synagogue and the struggle with current forces, were bound indissolubly together. Tradition can be a very living thing.

Third, the new attitude toward social action is not just quietistic or fatalistic. It is true that there is a real peril of fatalism and quietism in the new orthodoxy. But it is not actually fair to accuse the proponents of this. The follower of the new orthodoxy is suspicious of pre-war programs. Pre-war Europe knew what it ought to do; it was a little more of what it was doing. Now there has been the hand-writing on the wall. What can you do but stop? Not stop forever, but stop to reconsider. It is a pause to receive new orientation from something above our civilization which cannot be ignored. If we do stop and reconsider, the new type of social action will be a more creative type than that which we stopped doing.

Fourth, there is a new attitude toward secular culture, but not one which is finally anti-cultural. Visser t'Hooft, who is himself a Barthian, says that he is not permanently anti-cultural and anti-secular. But he feels that there is no good in baptizing a "secular" culture as religious. When culture has gotten out of control and lost its center, it needs a new center. The time doubtless will come when more will it be the duty of the church to participate in the building of a new world order. But that time is not yet. Our business today is to disentangle ourselves from a culture that is going to pieces. We must back away sufficiently so that

we can attack it and recreate it. The new Orthodoxy feels it has a role of that sort.

We face the peril of a secular culture with no religious center and, on the other hand, of a religious movement which apparently has no cultural reference and no interest in culture. We cannot simply turn away from this secularized culture, nor will it be adequate for the emergency we face to baptize in the name of religion what is now being done. We need a new myth; not only theology but mythology. This mythology is not merely a bad science. It is a great mistake to turn good myth into bad science. Rosenberg proposes to galvanize humanity into new life by a very bad myth, the myth of blood and sword. Civilization desperately needs a new religious center and religion cannot do the service that is required of it unless it maintains sufficient detachment from contemporary civilization and sufficient contact with those mysterious forces which are changing our civilization to make it possible to provide a fulcrum that will move the world.

Open Discussion:

In the general discussion which followed, Dr. Ross Sanderson of the City Federation of Churches of Buffalo, New York, emphasized the practical difficulties arising in any united Protestantism in a city, difficulties which are increased by this sharpening of theological differences. The less the differences are sharpened and made apparent, the better, he said.

In answer to a question, Professor Horton emphasized that the new Orthodoxy is not a return to Platonic dualism, nor is it a return to supernaturalism as the miraculous. The emphasis of the new Orthodoxy is that there is a something which comes as an event not predictable and which we must welcome with piety and be willing to be changed by it. Professor Bower commented that, in his judgment, the central issue concerned the question of continuity or discontinuity. Another person said that if the individual is mastered by things about him such as

war, for example, then there is no chance for creativity. He also asked who decides what point in the tradition should be taken in criticism of the culture? Who decides on the badness or goodness of the myth? Professor Schilpp felt that an impasse had been reached. The whole issue is a metaphysical one; it is undemonstrable and is a matter of attitude.

The chairman of the discussion, Professor Elliott, said that the issue in the United States is not between Karl Barth and Professor Bower, but is rather between the modified positions of Paul Tillich and Emil Brunner as compared with that of Professor Bower. He suggested that possibly the gaps between the positions were not as wide as they at first seemed and effort should be made to discover the agreements and define the disagreements more carefully.

Professor Horton followed up the chairman's suggestions by indicating that Karl Barth himself does not completely understand how relevant empirical facts are to his position. Students sometimes say that Barth has delivered us from history and psychology. If that is the consequence, then it is momentous for religious education as we understand it. But history and psychology have had a large part in producing Karl Barth. In answer to the question as to who is to decide what tradition or myth is to be used, I would hope that all of us would help in making the decision. But decide we must. Professor Aubrey says that one of the things which is needed is more decision. One of the weaknesses of liberalism has been its tendency to a certain indecisiveness, forever suspending judgment. Decisiveness is something which is demanded by the actuality of the contemporary situation. But if our decisions are simply made out of the blue, by a mysterious communion with something that is breaking in upon us and shattering our previous beliefs, so help all of us! If there is no common platform of revelation, no appeal to empirical facts in our decisions, then we are lost. We must continue the

direction of scientific control, of the exploration of rational logical possibilities, even in the presence of these shattering and unpredictable elements of life which hold us under judgment of the superhuman and the supernatural.

Professor Bower took up the issue of continuity or discontinuity, raised by Professor Horton's discussion. He said that the conception of discontinuity must be submitted to thorough-going analysis before we posit it as a characteristic of reality as we know in the modern world. Science has gone on the assumption that there are these gaps in our experience, but also on the assumption that if people search deeply enough in many cases they will find a relationship between events and have a chance to control the situation because the gaps are closed. For the people in Pasteur's day the anthrax which was killing the sheep represented a great discontinuity. Pasteur worked on the assumption that the nexus might be found. My knee was causing me trouble a short time ago. The doctor looked me over and found the relation for what would have been a completely discontinuous experience before we had modern science. He said: Have you had your teeth X-rayed? He looked for the cause three or four feet above my knee. Before the advent of medical science I would have been told: Too bad; perhaps the Lord in his good providence will heal you. For one of the great discoveries of the war in connection with a devastating disease, there were six hundred and six experiments, all of which were failures, before the cure was finally found.

The theory of discontinuity makes prediction impossible. If we surrender continuity, we short-circuit the process of critical research based upon experimental method. We bring into reality a metaphysical quality which more patience might very well have bridged. I am very conservative about the notion that a stroke out of heaven is coming upon Europe as judgment. I accept what is occurring as a judgment; but I believe careful study

would fill the gap. It might very well lead us to analyze the treaty of Versailles. Given Versailles, Hitler is as inevitable as the other end of the formula, two plus two. The principle of discontinuity has not solved the social and intellectual problems of the world. It has short-circuited them. They have been solved by men with patience and disciplined intelligence and merciless search for facts to build up a new case. Upon the basis of the evidence, it seems to me a fair assumption that the world of our experience is a world of continuity.

Dr. Ross Sanderson again pressed the practical question, which had not yet been considered. He wished to know if there was any possibility at all of the orthodox in ecclesiasticism and theology and progressive religious educators getting together in practical churchmanship. He said this was the problem which had to be dealt with locally month after month. Something would have to be done about it practically in the field of churchmanship or else we shall have either a barren ecumenical church which has gone dogmatic or a sterile liberalism. He added this question: Am I wrong in the feeling that the high churchman, who is a traditionalist, has a courage for social action that the liberal lacks?

Dr. Stewart Cole followed up Professor Bower's discussion of continuity and discontinuity, saying that he had no criticism of Professor Bower's point of view so far as he went. But the logic of this position is that we would explain a crisis solely by reference to sociological and anthropological material. We would explain the crisis in Europe through history and contemporary culture. If we grant that, we have met a crisis by science. Where then is religion and where is God? The Barthian feels a necessity for something more, and psychologically underneath that movement is a desire for this otherness and for rapport between man and God. In spite of ourselves, we tend to a humanistic explanation which throws us on the defensive when trying to account for

the reality of God and how he comes into our life. I repudiate the Barthian explanation, he continued, but I am hungry in my soul for something.

Professor Chave said he thought it was a matter of tools in thinking that caused the difficulty. The tool for understanding the differences is found in social psychology. The question of where we get our ideas does not arise for one who is not trained in social psychology. He thinks we get them directly. We need more consideration of the social process of thought. That something is called natural by one group, by the other supernatural, is probably more due to their way of thinking than to anything else. The experiences of Barth have led him to a certain conclusion, but he does not think of this as a person would who has been trained in social psychology. It is not a matter of events; it is the way they regard the source of ideas.

Mr. Wornom said he could illustrate Professor Chave's point from his experience in attending Professor Tillich's course in Systematic Theology. There is much misunderstanding of what he means by his students who tend to interpret his meaning in terms of orthodox conceptions. He himself has been engaged in religious education for twelve years and belongs to the tradition of George A. Coe. He described to Professor Tillich an example of education in race relationships, in connection with which there was no use of an altar, no mention of God or Jesus, but in connection with which the young people had done creative thinking and courageous action. He did not even presume to call it religious experience. But Professor Tillich said that represented what he meant by religion. Those who interpret Professor Tillich through their orthodox conceptions of the terms entirely misunderstand him.

Bishop W. J. Walls of the A.M.E. Zion Church, Chicago, raised the practical question as to what it was expected he would do about all this that was being talked about. The method of meeting

tension by the Christian primary group throughout the ages has been a retreat from culture. They have not tried to grapple with it, when it thins out religion. Instead of staying in the culture and fighting it out and becoming a part of the culture, religion has set itself against the culture. You are so far from where I am in the group with which I am dealing, that you leave me feeling that while the R.E.A. is a very necessary group, I wonder what you want me to do with my people. You are fifty or a hundred years ahead of them. I have a profound respect for the definitions which have been given, but I cannot get these concepts over to them. They want a resting place, a creed, a committal. How far can we go in this interacting process toward the unknown without these things. We must meet people's needs. Please tell me what I am to do.

Dr. Stewart Cole suggested that we press Professors Bower and Horton further and try to get a little closer together. Professor Bower responded by saying that he found it quite impossible to separate science as a method of dealing with facts from this whole attitude in reference to the values which are inseparably involved in the processes of living. I become frightened as soon as we say that science does not give us an avenue to an understanding of God. God is just as present in the research laboratory of the campus as he is in the class rooms of the theological seminary. Analyze a little further our theory of knowledge in the light of our more recent insights. To set off scientific method from values is quite unrealistic. From the standpoint of knowledge, perception is not photographic recording of the objects in our physical world. It is selective because it is the function of an organism that is cherishing certain attitudes in reference to certain functional ends that further the wellbeing of the organism itself. Thinking and values merge in these crisis situations where we must do something about the business of living. In a recent book

on *Knowledge and Conviction*, the emphasis is made that the process of thinking is always directed by the predicted outcomes of a given situation. But it is in the realm of values. That process is always selective. When we get down to the long last, our knowledge is controlled by our values. No concept can hold out against the tides of life which has not survival value with reference to the wellbeing for all of us in the human scene. God is not concerned just with values. God is concerned with science and art, with the processes of distribution, and his heart is sore and torn because we do not know more about the way of love in production. He is not only in the beyond, but in the here and now. God is trying to make the good prevail in a mixed world where he himself is frustrated again and again.

Professor Horton said that what Professor Bower had intimated about the relationship between the beyond and the immediate is something which the Christian idea of God at its best and in its most traditional forms liked to say. In C. C. J. Webb's term, it is the tension between the ultimate and the intimate. Traditionalism from the remote past may be nearer the present than later history. Day before yesterday or even before that there may be a period in history so like the crisis our civilization has reached in the cyclic development of culture that it is pertinent to the present situation. If liberalism is to retain true contemporaneity, it must somehow learn the art of stepping off from the present, not for the sake of a permanent retreat but for the sake of a new run in the contemporary situation.

In response to a question from Dr. E. W. Blakeman of the University of Michigan, Professor Horton said that he was enough of an empiricist to say that there was no absolute guarantee that this would happen. But the great traditionalists have dared to take that kind of risk. There are antiquarians in whose hands these musty documents came alive because something in them answered to contemporary needs. The old phrase, when it answers to con-

temporary life, is no longer the same. It is not a re-creation or a revival. Something creative takes place. The question is not whether the old phrase is used or a new phrase is coined. It is whether we have a secularized culture and an inert church, or a religious movement which is a vitalizing center for a whole culture. There is no guarantee as to which will happen. Dr. Blakeman asked by what method the historical tradition would be interpreted. Professor Horton replied that apocalypticism must be recognized, but that the terms of the New Testament, while in space symbolical, are in time literal.

Rabbi Isaac Landman said that he would like to speak to the practical problems raised by Bishop Walls and Dr. Sanderson. Going back to the beginnings, when man first discovered himself as a conscious being in the midst of a universe which he could not understand, no matter what his reasoning was, he came to a conclusion in which he took the existence of God, in whatever terms he explained it, for granted. Along comes a new human experience which threatens the God idea. Followers of scientists say they accept the scientist's explanation of the universe, but they cannot eliminate God from the picture. They cannot explain the relationship of the individual spirit to what they call the All-Spirit without some such being as previously we orthodox people have called God. After a hundred and fifty years of experimentation, scientists say we cannot explain this universe. What we have discovered are certain facts. We know how the universe behaves physically. Even so, we have to look for a unified ground which theologians call God. Read Millikan and Einstein and Comstock. The orthodox religionist says that notwithstanding what science has discovered, he stands pat. But he makes the discovery that if he stands pat, people have drifted away from the church. High school boys and girls are the really active atheists in our world today. In this situation, some say that there is something wrong with

the church. But we see that there are certain values which previously had been adjudged as being religious and which are necessary. We will preserve them. What will we do? We will start an ethical culture movement. We will start a humanistic movement. It will contain all of the values but with an unorthodox point of view. But why does humanism die abortive? It is not sufficient to account for man. Even these values which are ethical are not sufficient without what orthodox religionists have called God. A synthesis is possible. But no synthesis can be made without compromising, without attempting to understand the viewpoints of others, without being willing to enter into conference with the definite determination to submit to better scientific knowledge. There is no reason why liberal and orthodox should not meet in conference. We must discover what values are in orthodox Christianity and in orthodox Judaism which are so universal that they answer the fundamental questions of a human being, such questions as were raised by Dr. Cole. We must find values we can live by. More concretely, we shall have to discover what in orthodox Christianity and Judaism has to be given up to halt the desertion of the organized church. We must recognize that we have to give up this, that what there is of universal value may survive.

Request was made that Professor Ames speak again. Professor Ames said that physicists modify their theory on the basis of what they find by experimental methods. Electrons do not behave as they were formerly thought to behave. It is his conviction that the experimental method is precisely the method for a fruitful religious procedure and he thinks it was the method of Jesus. He emphasized love as the great fundamental attitude—an attitude, not a doctrine or a dogma. If ye know the truth, then the truth shall make you free. Love is an attitude which is implemented by knowledge. Religious life is cluttered up by traditional dogmas and theologies. We need to substitute ideology. With reference to the notion

of the "beyond," he thinks the idea is false that one cannot carry the process of the simpler experiences up into the more delicate and elaborate problems. He thinks the method goes all of the way through. As to continuity and discontinuity, he believes in this idea of emergence and real novelty. The old idea was that cause and effect relationships held absolutely. What was in the cause you would get in the effect. Scientific procedure questions that now, even denies it. This novelty gives a much more complicated world. The scientist does not claim to know everything. He is modest and recognizes the limitations of his knowledge, but he emphasizes the validity of what knowledge he does have. Every experiment is placed in a world beyond us, not in the sense of an absolutely different order but in terms of complexity. In the end, we shall find the essence and substance of religion in this natural piety, natural devoutness, in this humility of mind and sensitivity of spirit.

The chairman, Professor Elliott, in closing the meeting, said that while there were many differences of conviction and points of view which had not been resolved, there were four points of emphasis which had characterized the discussion of the two days and on which there seemed to be united conviction. First, the test of religion and of religious education is whether it becomes meaningful and relevant to the present scene. Second, despite the difficulties and the confusion, we have recognized the significant possibilities there are in the present situation. Third, we have all been more willing than we might have been in less difficult times to recognize the tragic elements in life and to acknowledge that no easy solution can be found. Fourth, whatever our theological viewpoint, we still see the need of human responsibility. We have lost any false pride we might have in what we can do, but have gained a new and sobering sense of responsibility.

The conference was led in a closing prayer by the chairman.

BOOK REVIEWS

BREMOND, ANDRE, S. J., *Religions of Unbelief*. Bruce, 163 pages, \$1.75.

This is a clear presentation of the essential nature of religion, and an effective contrast of the thought of the Church with that of modern rationalism. God, the source of all, cannot be comprehended by circumscribed man, except as God makes himself known to man through revelation and through science. By virtue of his limitations, man can discover but a fraction of the total truth. The Church, Father Bremond insists, is eager that science shall contribute its maximum to the store of discovered truth.

The difficulty with rationalism is that it seeks to build everything through its own discovered knowledge, which results in the creation of God in the image of man, or at least in the image of man's limited ideas.

In careful, scholarly fashion, the author canvasses Greek thought, the religion of Spinoza, Bertrand Russell's concept of religion without God, and H. G. Wells' concept of the Invisible King. Then follows a discussion of religion and its place in the modern scientific age, set over against religion as seen in the scope of history. Man, by searching, cannot find out God, but he persistently, hungrily seeks God.

A thoughtful reading, whether one agrees or not with the author's entire philosophical position, will help a reader see the problem of religion in our age in a clearer light. The book carries the *Imprimatur*. Laird T. Hites



BURTT, EDWIN A., *Types of Religious Philosophy*. Harpers, 512 pages, \$3.00.

A well balanced and competent treatment of the current types of religious thought within the Western World. The author's approach is philosophical rather than historical or psychological. The types discussed are considered as self-

consistent systems, with characteristic views concerning the nature of God and man, their relations to each other, human destiny, the nature of religious faith and its relation to scientific knowledge, freedom, the relation of religion to morals, and social problems. The types are treated in the sequence of their historic development, against their historical backgrounds in Judaism and early Christianity down to the Middle Ages, and with reference to the context of Western culture. The discussion of each type is concluded with a comparative analysis of the critical issues involved with reference to assumptions concerning: (1) Man's moral situation, (2) metaphysical knowledge, (3) knowledge of the supernatural, and (4) the structure of religious authority.

The types discussed are Roman Catholicism, Protestant fundamentalism, the religion of science, agnosticism, ethical idealism, modernism, and humanism. A chapter is added on some individual philosophies and current trends. The concluding chapter is devoted to a critical discussion of the major questions on which the several types present contrary positions. These issues are (1) the competence of human intelligence; (2) the certainty of religious knowledge; (3) the essential structure of the universe; (4) religion, metaphysics, history, and social ethics; and (5) method in religious philosophy.

The author has succeeded to a remarkable degree in achieving objectivity and in a sympathetic exposition of widely variant systems of religious thought. He limits himself to description and analysis, without attempting a constructive statement of his own personal point of view. The reader is thus left free to make his own appraisals on the basis of the facts and analyses presented. The reader may differ with the author on such points as selection, classification, the placement of emphasis, but the author's choices in these

matters are probably as satisfactory as most other possibilities. Many will share the author's wish that his introduction to the study of the religious phase of Western culture had been of the sort presented in this book—and the reviewer would add, so well presented. This treatment is admirably adapted to the use of students as well as to the needs of the general reader who would understand the complexity of religion as a phase of our Western civilization.

William Clayton Bower

CAINE, HALL, *Life of Christ*. Doubleday, Doran, 1310 pages, \$3.50.

This posthumous work of Sir Hall Caine presents as beautiful, as complete, and as emotionally satisfying a picture of Jesus and his teachings as has ever been published. The author could have been sharper in his critical scholarship, but appreciation rather than criticism was his purpose.

To gain perspective he divides his work into three parts: before Christ, Jesus Christ, and after Christ. In this way the life is seen in its proper historical setting, and much that would otherwise prove confusing becomes clear. About 500 pages are thus taken for prelude and postlude, and some 800 pages for the life of Jesus himself.

The great struggle of mankind has been in the direction of God. It begins with primitive man, and achievement slowly develops with the development of the race. Mr. Caine traces this development through primitive life, up through the Old Testament, and into the times of Jesus.

Jesus, he feels, is the most satisfying revelation of God. There is in his life and teachings no hint of church, or organization, or theology—simply the idea that men can find God by looking at him and following his pattern. His followers rationalized the church and its theology into being. The man Jesus is portrayed, then, as he really was, a patient, thoughtful, sympathetic individual, who believed he was God, and who sought to help men find God. Step by step his life is traced, and explained in simple, beautiful English. A reader almost sees Jesus in the story.

For a modern, even scientifically-minded man who has lost contact with the real

human Jesus in his endeavor to gain an intellectual concept of him, the book is a treasure. Placed in the hands of intelligent, thoughtful youth, it should prove a steady influence toward religious faith.

Laird T. Hites

CALHOUN, ROBERT L., *What Is Man?* Association Press, 78 pages, 50c.

Professor Calhoun's question, "What is man?" may be answered in four different ways: in terms of common sense experience, of science, of philosophy, and of religion. Dr. Calhoun follows each of these four ways through, and finds that each offers a necessary approach which a wise man will not belittle. A positive Christian himself, he finds in the Jewish-Christian tradition the most satisfying synthesis. Common sense, science and philosophy have limits beyond which they cannot go; but faith and hope, which are practical attitudes or ways of living, offer means by which intelligent and well motivated men may reach satisfying conclusions.

Professor Calhoun has a strong book here, so satisfying that this reviewer plans to urge its careful reading upon his students.

Laird T. Hites

CHAMBERLIN, GEORGIA L., *Making the Bible Live*. U. of Chicago Press, 384 pages, \$3.00.

Miss Chamberlin's is one of the most recent among a number of books that have recently appeared on the utilization of the Bible. These publications reflect a revived interest in and appreciation of the Bible. As a result of many factors, among them the early results of historical and critical study, the Bible, as Miss Chamberlin points out in her Introduction, has for some time fallen into disuse. This is in striking contrast to its place in Western culture and particularly among Protestants. But now it begins to appear that the findings of biblical criticism have opened the way to a new and more fruitful use of the Bible than was ever possible before.

As a result a new approach is being made to the Bible—an exploration of ways for its utilization in the cultivation of the religious life. This approach is rooted in the insight into the functional

nature and origin of the literature of the Bible that sprang out of the warm, real, and vibrant life of the ancient Hebrew and Christian communities. Once it is seen how the various parts of the Bible were functionally related to the actual and concrete situations of once living persons and communities, the way is prepared for its functional guidance of contemporary religious persons.

The former of these tasks Miss Chamberlin undertakes in her book. She reconstructs, not only through competent historical knowledge, but with sympathetic human insight, the situations out of which various parts of the Old Testament grew. Through an imagination disciplined by knowledge she makes these situations live. Under her hand the Old Testament becomes a living book.

The book is popularly written and will be useful not only to ministers, but to lay teachers of religion. Her many years of experience as secretary of the American Institute of Sacred Literature has given her an understanding of the practical needs of that great company of men and women engaged in the teaching of religion in local and church groups.

William Clayton Bower



DAWSON, CHRISTOPHER, *Progress and Religion. Sheed and Ward, \$1.00.*

This compact little volume is a study of the relation between religion and culture. The author maintains that every culturally vital society must possess a religion, whether explicit or disguised, and that the religion of a society determines to great extent its cultural form. Great religions are the foundations on which great civilizations rest. In modern societies and in social philosophies where religion seems to be denied, there seems to be a remnant of Christian thinking or of religious thinking which tends to mold some of the practice, for "a civilization cannot strip itself of its past." For example, the ideas of progress among the Liberals of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries took on the character of the millennialist idealism. "The drifting force of the socialist movement, in fact, has always been its belief in a social apocalypse." When religion dominated the thinking of Europe, it tended to unify people. Today

Europe lacks forces, even material ones, which will bring about this unification. Spiritual unity has deteriorated under the modern scientific view of nature which regards the world as a closed order. "It seems as though a new society was arising which will acknowledge no hierarchy of values, no intellectual authority, and no social or religious traditions, but which will live for the moment in a chaos of pure sensation." The revolutionary attitude in modern Europe is a symptom of the divorce between religion and social life. The secularization of society is a token of social decay. In proportion as the spiritual element recovers its natural position at the center of our culture, it will necessarily become the mainspring of our whole society.

Edna M. Baxter



FOERSTER, NORMAN, *The Future of the Liberal College. Appleton-Century, 103 pages, \$1.25.*

The author proposes "to consider the college in relation to the conception of life now dominant in our society," which he takes to be "materialistic and humanitarian." He feels the liberal college is threatened by extinction and that a reassertion of its distinctive mission is highly necessary. Although guarded in the past by religion, politics, and liberal education, the individual is now being completely swallowed up by society. Religion has become diluted to a humanitarian social program; our Constitution is being seriously undermined; and education has forgot what the liberal arts are. Mr. Foerster limits himself to the educational aspect.

The new, illiberal philosophy found its expression in education in President Eliot's Power and Service ideology. Education is to be for Power (science or power over nature) and Service (vocational training or power over human society). All of this in the eyes of the author amounts to sanctioning openly the crudest materialism and to encouraging the all too human lust for goods and power over others. Since the poor possess nothing worth taking from them, they should be taught some vocation so they can earn something so that it will be profitable to "serve" them. This logically results in a sentimental collectivism in which

all are trained to "serve" for the highest price the market will stand. John Dewey in the field of "Education" completes the picture and pulls the rope for the last stroke of the death knell for liberal education. Fascism, communism, collectivism and all the rest are merely variations and intensifications of the Power and Service theme. The antidote for this whole outlook is the attitude of Sir Thomas Browne: "I give no alms only to satisfy the hunger of my brother, but to fulfill and accomplish the Will and Command of my God; I draw not my purse for his sake that demands it, but His that enjoined it; I relieve no man upon the Rhetorick of his miseries, nor to content mine own commiserating disposition."

Mr. Foerster then examines critically some of the ideas that have originated at Teachers' College, Columbia University, and the conception of College Education at the University of Chicago. Any progress toward a liberal outlook "must be slow, for the disciples of Francis Bacon and John Dewey, who are many, are committed to relativity instead of principles, to a sophisticated opportunism instead of rational purposefulness, to fact-gathering and experimentalism rather than the application of ideas; but progress there will be, in proportion as one man here, another there, awakes to the bankruptcy of the modern mind."

The question of curriculum is easily settled—merely decide on the purpose of a college and the curriculum will flow naturally from this. The first step is to introduce real books to give perspective and reveal our place in a great tradition which we should preserve and transmit to the future. The faculty "more than anything else enfeebls the small college of today." It is manifestly impossible to achieve a liberal education by means of an illiberal faculty. If a teacher has sold his soul to Power and Service, he is *ipso facto* unfit to do a liberal job.

Those of you who are unacquainted first hand with the hopelessly peasant-like outlook of the great unwashed who have studied "Education," who are out to "re-condition" and "re-motivate" and "train" for "power and service," who *insist* (!) on injecting "cultural subjects" into the curriculum, who like to "balance" voca-

tional and liberal arts classes and all the rest—you will find this book a little strange and uncalled for. To those of us who have to contend with the educational fascists, however, it is a different story. Mr. Foerster lays the nerve bare and probes around it mercilessly. Although he is apparently congenitally incapable of stepping out of a rather stilted academic rôle and sympathetically understanding and appreciating the scientific outlook and a man like the justifiably famous John Dewey, what he says about Dewey's clod-hopping counterfeiter is only too true. One must admit that it is rather hard to justify turning practically all of our public education, and a goodly proportion of our private as well, over to the "Educators" who are so woefully uneducated even if they have completed a rather elaborate apprenticeship in plumbing lay-outs and heating, diet and lighting, school transportation and chimney construction. As yet no substitute for background, breeding, for love of good literature, for the liberal tradition has been found. We ought all to admit openly that a yokel is still a yokel even if some trade school has conferred upon him the doubtful honor of allowing him to write Ph. D. in Education after his name. He remains as unfit to associate with youth in an educational capacity as any other master mechanic or journeyman. They may be the best janitors, illuminating engineers, purchasing agents, accountants, and school contractors obtainable—but hardly educators.

The implications of all this for morality and religion are obvious. An infinite amount of training in "Education" (even if the superfluous "Religious" be added) cannot take the place of just a little religious and moral insight. These last are not to be acquired by injections of technical training, regardless of the names of the courses and hours of credit. Completion of all the required work will not add one tittle. They are simply the fruits of a spirit carefully nourished year after year in a certain kind of tradition and supported by a certain kind of human example that reveals in itself the beauty and winsomeness of good taste, gentle attitudes and loving-kindness. This alone can create in men respect and love for their fellowmen and a quiet passion for

God. True religion is a part of the liberal tradition; or the liberal tradition is a part of true religion. It makes no difference how we say it. In any case it behooves every religious person to take thought about the future of the liberal college in America.

Robert C. Provine



GREENWOOD, WM., O., *Biology and Christian Belief*. Macmillan. 192 pages, \$1.75.

This book has neither the breadth nor the depth of J. Arthur Thomson's classic, *The System of Animate Nature*, but it is in the same tradition. It is an effort to point up the evidence which the biological sciences have to offer in support of a purposive and religious interpretation of the world and human life. In lamentably brief compass the author undertakes to establish a series of highly controversial propositions: that "the whole physical universe is immaterial to the very core"; that creationism is the most tenable hypothesis with respect to the problem of the origin of the world and of life; that purpose, and not random variation, dominates the whole range of organisms; and that "life in its real nature is immortal." In his discussion of these ideas, Dr. Greenwood does not wander far from the old "arguments from design," but there is much which is novel and significant by way of illustration.

The most significant contribution which the book has to make is its strenuous denial that the data of physics and biology require a mechanistic interpretation of life. The central thesis is that "up to a certain point mechanism has a hand in the game, as it were, but pushed to ultimate conclusions and as an explanation it completely fails." This, together with certain striking examples which are cited as proof, ought to furnish aid and comfort to those whose religious beliefs are being disturbed by the skeptical conclusions of many modern biologists and psychologists. It would be interesting to know if it alters the convictions of any of the mechanists.

The title is, in a sense, a misnomer; it seems to assume that "Christian Belief" will naturally follow upon the demonstration that these ghosts of scientific material-

ism lack the substance of genuine proof. Such an assumption is plainly naive. Herein lies the weakness of all apologetics. It may rout the critics; it cannot convert the sinners. "Christian Belief" cannot stand in contradiction to the assured conclusions of natural science; at the same time, faith does not seek from those conclusions its primary warrant for existence.

—Albert C. Outter



WILLIAMS, JOHN PAUL, *Social Adjustment in Methodism, Teachers College, Columbia U.*, 131 pages, \$1.60.

This volume is a scholarly study based upon the assumption that social institutions necessarily respond to altered environment and that, since the church is indispensable, it must use periodic appraisal and continuous, self-conscious change to meet the needs of changing times. Using one religious body as a basis for interpreting problems that are common to all, the author sought by means of the interview and the questionnaire to discover what lay leaders and ministers believe concerning discipline, government, worship, functions and social pronouncements of the church in comparison with authoritative documents and actual practice in Methodism. He concluded that disciplinary standards need revision, the power of the bishop has decreased as the autonomy of the local congregation has increased, organization is being modified for the sake of efficiency, lay leaders believe a major function of the church is to help people live better lives, and outstanding pronouncements of the church on social issues express lay convictions to a degree greater than is generally supposed.

In an illuminating chapter on worship the chief reasons given by board members for church attendance are summarized as: (1) in the habit of going; (2) enjoy church; (3) for fellowship, to meet people; (4) for spiritual help; (5) to set a good example to others; (6) to get help in my daily living.

The significance of this book for religious education is its suggestions of technique for appraisal of church procedures and stimulating questions for vital group discussions, such as: Can a creed be formed which represents the convictions

of contemporary Christians? Do a large body of church members consider the church to exist for the purpose of giving divine sanction to current morality? What is the effect on the church of large property holdings? What correlation is there between individual willingness to vote for a social pronouncement and conduct in keeping with the pronouncement?

Harold F. Humbert

BRIEFER MENTION

ANDERSON, DWIGHT, *What It Means to Be a Doctor. Medical Society of the State of New York*, 2 East 103rd, N. Y., 87 pages, \$1.00.

Preparation for medicine requires longer, more difficult, and more costly training than preparation for any other profession. In order that the public might know something of the background of physicians, and that pre-medical students might understand better their prospective profession, a layman wrote this book for the Medical Society. It is written in biographical form and pictures Dr. "Edgar James," son of a successful physician, as he passes through various aspects of his training and into his profession. It is a stimulating, useful "general" book, highly to be recommended.

ARRARAS, JOAQUIN, *Francisco Franco. Bruce*, 248 pages, \$2.50.

A definitive biography, from the background of Franco in El Ferrol, through his childhood and youth, into the army where he rose to high position, and down to the present. Franco is pictured as a deeply religious man, an excellent militarist, a good administrator, deeply loyal to the best interests of Spain.

A Catholic book, under the editorship of Dr. Husslein in the Science and Culture Series.

BELL, MARJORIE, Editor, *The Offender in the Community. 1938 Yearbook of the National Probation Association. 50 W. 50, New York*. 396 pages, \$1.75.

This volume of papers presented at the Seattle Conference of the Association in 1938 contains an excellent summary of what progressive communities are doing and may do to rehabilitate delinquents, criminals, and other offenders. Penal incarceration is not a solution, according to the social workers, but a confession of failure. Their approach is distinctly social: people are human beings; the result of inheritance, sometimes good and sometimes poor; more largely the result of socially conditioned forces. The problem becomes (1) one of prevention through the development of a better social order; and (2) of reconditioning through the provision of a better environment. The statement of the problem and discussions and analyses of the techniques for

reconditioning form the substance of this book.

A reader will find here an excellent introduction and survey of the whole problem.—*Laird T. Hites*

BURKHART, ROY A., *Understanding Youth. Abingdon*, 176 pages, \$1.50.

This is distinctively an adult age. A hundred years ago there were 889 adults to 1000 youth under sixteen. In 1936 there were 2100. Adults think for youth too much, plan their education, their programs, and determine the economic world into which they will fit.

Dr. Burkhardt feels that this is largely a mistaken emphasis. Youth need leaders, they want to follow, it is true; but they want leaders who will inspire them to want to do for themselves. After all, it is the adolescent himself who does the living, the praying, the working, the aspiring, who dreams the dreams—and who must put them into action. And these adolescents of today will become the leaders of adolescents tomorrow.

Can a church program be constructed on this basis? Dr. Burkhardt has proved in his Columbus church that it can, and in the later chapters of this book suggests how.—*Frank Meyerson*

CAVERT, S. M., Editor, *The Church Faces the World. Round Table Press*, 133 pages, \$1.50.

Ten American scholars prepared this volume which is edited by the General Secretary of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America. Dr. Cavert writes the third chapter. The social message which the book delivers was prepared for the Madras Conference of the International Missionary Council held in December 1938. Throughout the volume there is unity because the writers have the social point of view. The Oxford Conference had great weight in determining the conclusions of this volume; the Edinburgh Conference very little. The book is empirical rather than theological and this is its charm.—*W. A. Harper*

COHEN, SAMUEL M., *Guiding Jewish Youth. The United Synagogue of America, New York, 3080 Broadway*. 185 pages, \$2.00.

This little book by Rabbi Cohen is, emphatically, a tract for the times. It deals with the question of aiding youth in the difficult process of fitting themselves for participation in the activities and relationships of adult life.

Although the book is written for and about Jewish youth, its reflections and suggestions are, for the most part, applicable to the youth of other ethnic groups. Most of the questions discussed in the book are general—sex, for example, leadership and its qualities, forms of organizations, programs, ways and means of avoiding discord and friction and of maintaining lively interest in youth organizations.

On these and other points the author has much to say that is manifestly based on ample practical knowledge as well as on up-to-date scientific study.

There is need of a philosophy and of a well-planned, coordinated and graduated scheme of youth organization. Leaders of youth need more than zeal and enthusiasm, more than tact, to

achieve success; they require clear ideas based on psychology, physiology and modern ethics. These Rabbi Cohen supplies.—*Victor S. Yarros*

CONWAY, JANE E., *Intaglios. Christopher*, 161 pages, \$1.75.

Miss Conway's *Intaglios* are eight dramatic mystery playlets, copyrighted, and to be reproduced only with permission. She adapts classical stories such as *The Ballad of Alice Brand* from *The Lady of the Lake*; *The Sicilian's Tale* by Longfellow; and *Thomas Moore's Paradise* and *the Peri*—using them as the basis for poetical dramatizations. Entirely appropriate for church or young people's groups—for which indeed they are intended.

CURRAN, EDWARD L., *Great Moments in Catholic History. Grosset & Dunlap*, 114 large pages, \$1.25.

In order that Catholic youth in later childhood and early adolescence might understand and believe the faith, Dr. Curran has written one hundred brief descriptions of that many great moments in the history of the church, and Samuel Nisenson has illustrated them with appropriate drawings. The work is attractively executed and should serve its purpose well. Needless to say, non-Catholic historians might place different interpretations on some of the events described, and objective educators would accuse the authors of striving more through propaganda than education.

DAYAL, HAR, *Twelve Religions and Modern Life. Modern Culture Institute, Edgeware, Middlesex, England*, 250 pages, 2/6.

Here is history of religions for the humanist. The author has here attempted to indicate "some elements of value in twelve religious systems from the standpoint of humanism. The new gospel of humanism comes to fulfill all the old dispensations. Their objectionable features are noted very briefly, but their merits are explained and expounded for the benefit of humanists and others." To get his *twelve* religions he includes Sufism and Positivism. He does not include the Sikh faith as a separate religion. In pointing out what humanism can approve in each religion the author gives an idea of what he conceives humanism to be. One wonders if American humanists would agree with some of the author's statements. The book is useful in stating simply many of the cardinal beliefs and practices of the various faiths. It would not do to regard it as in any sense an adequate treatment of any one of the religions.—*Charles S. Braden*

DODD, CHARLES H., *History and the Gospel. Scribners*, \$2.00.

Professor Dodd of Cambridge University seeks to discover the historical aspect of the gospels. His viewpoint is in contrast to the modern school which emphasizes their religious and not historical aspects. He maintains that the writers bore witness to the revelation of God, and that "Christianity rests upon the affirmation that a series of events happened, in which God

revealed Himself in action, for the salvation of men." Most pertinently he criticizes the "apocalyptic school" as an impatient generation which prefers to set its hopes upon revolution or the catastrophic element in Christianity. The author examines the writings of Paul as a foundation for his study of the gospels. He says the epistles were written with "the assumption of an historical Figure as a perpetual point of reference." The Gospel "is designed to place the hearers in the very presence of the historical event, and so to expose them to the power of God which worked in the event."—*Edna M. Baxter*

DUNNE, J. W., *The Serial Universe. Macmillan*, 240 pages.

Mr. Dunne, author of *An Experiment With Time*, restates his alleged epistemological "proof" of immortality, based upon the circumstance that description of the world as including its observer generates an infinite series of observing selves acting in distinct time-systems. Whether the premise, that we act as if there were an ultimate "real" and eternal observer, implies the actuality of such a being, is the crux of the argument.

Unfortunately, a semi-popular style, quite apart from startling conclusions, will render the work suspect among scientists; while a battery of difficult arguments may intimidate the common reader.—*W. A. Wick*

FIELDING, MICHAEL, *Parenthood: Design or Accident? Vanguard*, 239 pages, \$2.50.

A manual on birth control written by a physician and first published in England. Preface by H. G. Wells. As clear-cut and objective a treatment as could be desired. A first chapter discusses the pros and cons of the subject, three chapters deal with principles and methods of control, and another states its objectives. A glossary and a list of clinics in the United States add to the usefulness of the volume.

FOSDICK, HARRY EMERSON, *A Guide to Understanding the Bible. Harper*, 348 pages, \$3.00.

A scholarly study of how the principal ideas which give content to the Christian religion developed in the Bible. Christians hold ideas about God, Man, Right and Wrong, Suffering, Fellowship with God, Immortality. The Bible, which developed through a long evolutionary process, gave initial form to these ideas, which in the centuries since have been criticized and elaborated, but always with biblical reference in the background. Chronological lists, bibliography, and elaborate indices furnish tools for scholarly study.—*Frank Meyerson*

FOX, EMMET, *The Sermon on the Mount. Harper*, 153 pages, \$1.50.

Dr. Fox, a successful electrical engineer, read Emerson. Then Jesus. He discovered Power, which is attainable through what he calls "Scientific Prayer." By this he means that one turns

himself wholeheartedly, serenely, knowingly, toward God, and permits God to work his will. In this series of comments on the Sermon on the Mount, Dr. Fox discusses Jesus' concept of religion and of Power through it, and makes numerous constructive comments. The book is more religious than critical, as it is intended to be.



FULLER, THOMAS, *The Holy State and the Profane State*. Edited by Maximilian G. Walten. *Columbia Press*, 2v, 338 and 441 pages, \$7.00.

First printed in 1642, now reproduced in facsimile with very copious notes. Fuller was a young clergyman, gifted as a writer of thumb-nail vignettes. His *Holy and Profane "States"* is a medley of character writings, short essays, and biographies, forming altogether a splendid commentary on the conduct and spirit of men and women and their attitudes toward each other and toward God. The books provide an enlightening record of the social, economic, religious and political life of an interesting age, very different and yet very similar in human nature to our own.



The Great Story. *Harcourt, Brace*, 101 large pages, \$2.00.

This story of Jesus' life is a composite of the gospel narratives in the King James Version, and includes those simple and basic teachings which have become the Christian heritage of all Western peoples. Fifteen great paintings by renowned artists are included in full color. A beautiful book, especially appropriate as a gift.



HALL, W. S., *Eyes on America*. *Studio Publications*, 150 pages, 8x11½, \$3.50.

Mr. Hall has brought together more than two hundred paintings of American scenes by American artists, covering city and country, drouth and flood, mining and farming, work and play, heroic and pathetic. They are modern paintings in the modern manner, but they depict America. Mr. Hall contributes an Introduction, and a brief commentary on each scene.



HARMON, FRANK L., *Principles of Psychology*. *Bruce*, 609 pages, \$3.50.

This layman teaching in a Catholic (Saint Louis) university introduces his book with a Preface in which he makes clear the essential Catholic position with respect to the dualism of human nature. The purely physical represents one side; the purely spiritual and mental (or soul) represents the other. Both, however, operate jointly in a psycho-physical unity. In the final chapter he discusses the nature of man. In between we have a clear-cut, scientific psychology text, well-written, with abundant illustration taken from everyday living.



HARPER, W. A., *The Minister of Education*. *The University Post Publishing Co., Ashland, Ohio*, 159 pages, \$2.00.

The author is well known in circles of religious education and is a professor in the Vander-

bilt School of Religion. The book was chosen by the Religious Book Club as a supplementary selection. It is a fictitious story of the reorganization of a church by the acceptance of a trained minister of education and the endorsement of the creative method of religious education. The writer has skillfully presented a digest of recent educational theories by having the new minister of education explain his philosophy in a series of speeches. Each time he speaks he quite carries away his audience and they unanimously vote to follow what he has told them. Would that it were so in real life! A wealthy member of the church agrees to finance the scheme as it advances. Perhaps the author has become too enthusiastic about the new minister and his method, for it sometimes seems as if the transmissive method is the key to the adoption of the creative method.—*Ernest J. Chave*



HAYWARD, PERCY R., *Your Life and the Church*. *Abingdon*, 75 pages, thirty-five cents.

Dr. Hayward strikes a high spiritual note in the opening chapter of this little book and maintains it throughout. Whether your local church believes in conversion or confirmation as the doorway to the Kingdom's entrance this little book will be invaluable to you. It is designed to satisfy leaders whose churches believe either in conversion or confirmation as the method of entering the Kingdom. It amply serves the purpose of its writing.



Historical Atlas of the Holy Land. *Rand McNally*, 32 pages 9½x12, \$1.00.

A comprehensive collection of forty-six maps including the ancient Mediterranean lands, Palestine before the conquest by Egypt, Egypt under Rameses II, Palestine of the tribes, under Saul, David, Solomon, the Empires of Syria, Assyria, Babylon, Persia, Rome, eight maps tracing the life of Jesus, ancient cities, the isles of Greece, and modern Palestine. Clear and beautiful, done with Rand McNally accuracy.



HOPWOOD, P. G. S., *A Testament of Faith*. *Macmillan*, 259 pages, \$2.00.

Dr. Hopwood, a Congregational minister, writes interestingly of the validity of religious experience. Religious experience is self-validating and God is the ultimate reality. There is an element of mechanism in life, but it is not all of life and it is ridiculous for us to rate religious experience down because we have never had it. It would be just as reasonable for a pseudo-scientist to rate science down or for a would-be musician to do the same of music as for a man who had not had religious experience to rate religion down.

Faith is the driving power. It is self-attesting as to feeling, as to thinking, and as to volition; but the final validity is God himself, in whom it is reasonable to believe.—*W. A. Harper*



HOUGH, LYNN HAROLD, *Free Men*. *Abingdon*, \$2.00.

Sentences in this book of essays leap from the pages alive, with the genius of the orator who

writes. The author's wisdom is a compound of great thought absorbed from the centuries, personal high-living-and-thinking and sensitivity to beauty. He discusses the reality of human freedom and its relation to intelligence, morals, art, literature, science, society and religion. With frankness he lays bare the ineptitude, shallowness and tragedy of our contemporary era and arouses hope for the future by showing man's capacity to extort greatness from hostile circumstances. He describes people who are intellectually naked and unashamed: "They do not know the difference between a wisecrack which brightly appeals to a prejudice and an epigram which is the crystallization of a true insight into a pungent phrase." In contrast he says, "What God is in eternity, Jesus Christ has made real in time." The book is rewarding because of its rich cultural background and its compelling convictions.—*Harold F. Humbert*



HUDSON, JAY WILLIAM, *The Old Faiths Perish.* Appleton-Century, 302 pages, \$2.00.

This book, written by a professor of philosophy at the University of Missouri, is not simply a funeral oration over dead faiths. While the author points out that the advent of science has caused people to repudiate or neglect old beliefs, he also asserts that the old faiths do not utterly perish. They are changed to meet the fundamental needs of human life as each generation conceives its needs. The basic quest which has been present among religious people has been the search for "a reasonable, complete, and social self-realization." All faiths will therefore change to meet growing life, but their function will still be to give man an integrated life, a full life, and a shared life. The author's interviews with the men of Kallos form a graphic way of criticizing our contemporary life and of stressing the values of a venturesome religion.—*Roland W. Schloerb*



JONES, OLIVE M., *Inspired Youth.* Harper, 322 pages, \$2.00.

Some two or three hundred very brief stories to be read by children around ten years of age. Each story illustrates a practical situation in which "talking to God" and "listening to God" effects a satisfactory outcome. Good stories, well told, appropriate for the purpose intended.



JONES, PHILIP C., *The Church School Superintendent.* Abingdon, 112 pages, \$1.00.

This book, in the Leadership Training Series, is written by the Associate Minister of the Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church of New York City. This church has a definite educational point of view in its whole program and there is no question but that the author has the united support of the senior minister, the officers of the church, and the young people whose cause he champions. The book is not a record of any special experiment, but the description of what an above-the-average school is doing. The title is somewhat misleading for the church school superintendent is not the centre of the stage, but the unconventional presentation will be sugges-

tive to many superintendents and ministers.—*Ernest J. Chave*



KAGAWA, TOYOHIKO, *Meditations on the Holy Spirit.* Cokesbury, 167 pages, \$1.50.

In jottings of beautifully Emersonian quality, externalizations of inner experience, Kagawa has recorded luminous hints as to the meaning of the Holy Spirit. He interprets Christ's promise of the Holy Spirit, its revelation in the Master's life, and spiritual phenomena in the Book of Acts, in the life of the Apostle Paul, and in Christian prayer. He discusses the Spirit as indweller, truth, comforter and sanctifier. Here are Kagawa epigrams: "A hermit is not holy;" "Sectarianism comes from jealousy;" "The fact itself that I am alive—to me this is the wonder of wonders;" "Governments at the present time are congregations of liars;" "Prayer has this potentiality of creating the new."—*Harold F. Humbert*



LAUBACH, FRANK C., *Toward a Literate World. Foreign Missions Conference,* 156 Fifth Ave., New York, 178 pages, \$1.75.

No single individual has been more concerned or tried to do more about the problem of illiteracy than the author of this book. Beginning in the Philippine Islands where he worked out methods for quickly teaching adult illiterates to read, he has gone at the call of people all over the Orient to help them do a similar thing among their respective peoples. Thus he is the Evangelist or apostle-at-large of literacy, serving the whole world. He has brought together in this book some exceedingly interesting material concerning illiteracy in various countries, facts that are little known to most of us. He has described his system of teaching, particularly in the Philippines, in such detail that any one with a similar problem anywhere else ought to find it suggestive and helpful. Incidentally he has some very pertinent things to say about the difference between teaching children and adults which would be of interest to most religious educators.—*Charles S. Braden*



LEE, EDWIN A., *Teaching as a Man's Job. Phi Delta Kappa,* Homewood, Illinois, 79 pages, 15 cents paper, 40 cents cloth.

A committee of Phi Delta Kappa, the educational fraternity, has prepared this gift book to be placed in the hands of the best all round students of high school graduating classes. In a half dozen chapters, and in well chosen words, it presents the unique role of the teacher in a democracy, his work, the system in which he works, and the rewards to be gained. An admirable piece of work.



LYDD, T. B., *Believest Thou This?* Meador, 116 pages, \$1.00.

What one layman believes about Christianity is summarized in sketchy paragraphs concerning religious ideas and biblical characters. Partly compilation and partly concepts of the author, the book asks, in capital letters at the end of each

section, the question which constitutes its title. The author's point of view is represented in these sentences: "God is a discovery, not an invention;" "God's remedy for nerves is a change of air, a new vision, and a bigger job."



LUPTON, DILWORTH, Religion Says You Can. *Beacon*, 191 pages, \$1.50.

A noted Unitarian minister fastens upon the idea that while individual men and women cannot reshape a disordered world order, they can build or discover stability within themselves. To help them do it is the theme of this book of very practical essays. Full of anecdote, applicable to the points at issue, it is glorious, thoughtful reading, inspirational good sense.



MACFARLAND, CHARLES S., The Christian Faith In a Day of Crisis. *Revell*, 226 pages, \$1.50.

Dr. MacFarland has a fine grasp of the contemporary situation. In each issue of the *Federal Council Bulletin* will be found his reviews of current books. Thirty-three of them are more carefully considered in this publication. The introduction and concluding synthesis of this book are original. Dr. MacFarland gives the impression in the volume that the main trouble with our time is that it has not settled opinions which may be approved or disapproved. We do not take our situation seriously enough and this is our main trouble.

In 1936 Dr. MacFarland gathered up from the *Federal Council Bulletin* in book form the first of the volumes that treated such books under the title *Contemporary Christian Thought*. In 1937 the second volume appeared under the title *Trends of Christian Thinking*. And now the third volume appears under the title given above.—*W. A. Harper*



MALONE, TED, American Album of Poetry. *Rodeheaver, Hall-Mack Co.*, 412 pages.

Over a good many years Ted Malone has been collecting gems of poetry, in part for use on his radio programs, but more because he loved good poetry. Most of the poets are "minor," or at least have not entered the "nationally advertised" class. Each poem is really a gem; Malone must have rejected twice as many as he included. They cover the entire gamut of human relationships, and are carefully grouped into homogeneous patterns.



MANGAN, JAMES T., The Knack of Selling Yourself. *Darrell*, 234 pages, \$2.50.

Brutally frank but beautifully clear. If a man does not sell himself, nobody else will, is the author's point of view. To people who want to sell themselves and to become "big shots" in their own right, he gives a business man's pointers on clothes, style, attitude, approach. . . . Self is the center of the whole picture; but change the motif to altruism, and much of Mr. Mangan's advice is very useful.

MAYORGA, MARGARET, Editor, One-Reel Scenarios for Amateur Movie-Makers. *French*, 231 pages, \$2.50.

This is a handbook for those who wish to make their own movies. To it have contributed producers, playwrights, and the Eastman Kodak Company. The book includes careful directions, suggestions for stories, a number of amateur performances suitable for filming, and several bibliographies. A study outline and glossary add to its usefulness. An authoritative book in its field.



McKEE, ELMORE M., What Use Is Religion? *Scribners*, 260 pages, \$2.00.

A former university pastor who rejoiced in his skeptical students and now rejoices in his skeptical church members, writes here religious (and Christian) answers to the critics and skeptics. His answer is that religion, while perfectly true to science, nevertheless transcends mere physical science and deals primarily with the psychological. It makes for the best understanding of the world and the universe, and of personality as well. It brings power of the best sort into life, because it interprets life. It allies the man with whatever is worth while in the universe; and yet it is reasonable and scientific. Dr. McKee has here the most satisfying book for the rational non-supernaturalist the reviewer has seen.—*Frank Meyerson*.



MOORE, J. H., Beyond the Altar Rail. *Fordham U. Press*, 113 pages, \$1.25.

Father Moore belongs to the Society of Jesus. In this little book he discusses the theology and ideals of Mass. It is a worth-while discussion from his point of view and will greatly strengthen the faith of many Christians who may read it.



MURRY, JOHN MIDDLETON, Heroes of Thought. *Julian Messner*, 368 pages, \$3.75.

The great English literary critic has selected the twelve men of relatively modern times whose ideas have freed the human mind of its shackles and set them to thinking critically and progressively. His choice includes Chaucer, Shakespeare, Montaigne, Cromwell, Milton, Wordsworth, Rousseau and Marx, Goethe, Godwin and Shelley, and William Morris. In his analysis of these men and their contributions in modern thought, Mr. Murry builds a consistently firmer case for democracy as against either of the two extreme forms, fascism and communism, which assail the world. Splendid, penetrating analysis.



NELSON, JANET FOWLER, Marriages Are Not Made in Heaven. *Womans Press*, 158 pages, \$1.25.

A discussion-study manual for groups of business girls, built around problems of man-woman relations in friendship, courtship and the engagement period. What relationships, particularly physical, are desirable, and what are the costs of too intimate contact? What about long engagements, or marriage before the economic structure is satisfactorily established? The book is built largely around the functioning of the reproductive system, and despite its brevity is adequate.

NOCK, ARTHUR DARBY, St. Paul. *Harper*, 251 pages, \$2.00.

Professor Nock of Harvard vividly reveals St. Paul in the scene of his times. He recognizes the difficulty of studying the writings of Paul and those about him because his "words and concepts . . . have become charged with the dogmatic controversies of later generations." The author does not deal with these later interpretations but tries "to forget for the moment all that happened after his execution at Rome," and seeks as far as he can "to view Paul as a man of the first century, living and moving and teaching in its peculiar conditions." This concise and scholarly study of St. Paul and of his writings is a valuable contribution.—*Edna M. Baxter.*



OGDEN, ROBERT M., *The Psychology of Art*. Scribners, 291 pages, \$2.50.

All art, Dean Ogden maintains, is an expression of human nature, and every work of art originates in a bodily expression of behavior. Behavior always seeks an end, and the record of its achievement becomes the work of art. It is "fine" art to the extent that its formal excellence impresses an observer. As a psychologist, Dean Ogden analyses the aesthetic experience, music, poetry, and the visual arts, and then draws them together in a careful discussion of aesthetic education. A scientific work that will be appreciated by religious leaders who are concerned with aesthetic expression, and by college teachers of the subject.



ROOD, ROYAL D., *Matrimonial Shoals*. Detroit Law Book Company, 424 pages, \$3.50.

In the Detroit area of Michigan there are 300,000 homes. Since 1915 there have been 100,000 divorces, besides uncounted desertions and otherwise broken homes. Pretty serious.

The attorney-author does not overlook economic, cultural, and physical maladjustments as significant factors, but feels they are commonly over-emphasized. He places a large responsibility for excessive divorces upon a law system which permits plaintiffs to gain some material advantage from the separation, and suggests a reformulation of divorce law.

An interesting viewpoint, thoughtfully expressed.—*Frank Meyerson.*



ROSS, PETER V., *A Digest of the Bible*. Prentice-Hall, 293 pages, \$2.75.

Peter Ross is a lawyer who has studied the Bible in its English form for many years and taught it successfully to large groups of people. From the King James Version he has selected the better-known narratives and united them with connecting comment. The result is a very readable, but uncritical book, that does give a good overview of the Bible as a whole. The type is very readable and the appearance of the book altogether attractive.

SHERILL, LEWIS J., *Understanding Children*. Abingdon, 218 pages, \$1.25.

The book is well motivated with a desire to help religious workers understand children in order that their teaching may become more meaningful and that growth of personalities may result. Many concrete suggestions are given but the general discussion is organized about the usual principles of educational psychology. The reader cannot escape the fact that the concept of God is more of a problem for children than the commonly assumed organizing centre of religious learning. The author is quite realistic in recognizing the limitations of children, but has a large faith in the influence of the right social environment. He believes that the church has a definite responsibility constructively to condition the various community agencies which affect the lives of growing persons. It is encouraging to find religious educators moving beyond classroom techniques to consider the wider relations of effective educational programs.—*Ernest J. Chave.*



SLAVSON, S. R., *Character Education in a Democracy*. Association Press, 226 pages, \$2.50.

Education that involves only the intellect baffles the child. That which involves subordination to the school system, the development of competitive attitudes and formal obedience to teacher's instructions, prepares the child for social obedience and conformity, but does not equip him for creative participation in a genuinely democratic social order.

Mr. Slavson discusses thoughtfully the nature of child personality, and studies the possibility of educating him through creative group contacts in the development of his own personality and for democratic participation in the social order.—*Frank Meyerson.*



STINCHFIELD, SARA M., and YOUNG, EDNA H., *Children with Delayed or Defective Speech*. Stanford U., 174 pages, \$3.00.

It has been thought that language development is so closely related to intelligence that a child with good sensory equipment who could not use words was feeble minded. These two ladies, one an educator and one a psychologist, have proved that many such children can be enormously helped, and in this book present both the therapy and the psychology underlying it.



WRIGHT, DONALD S., Editor, *Asking Them Questions*. Oxford, 242 pages, \$1.25.

Some two years ago a number of questions raised by boys were answered by leading religious and theological thinkers, and the answers published in book form. The questions only partially covered the subject of religion, of course, but the book was very useful. A second series of questions raised by young people has been answered by other Christian thinkers in this second book. What about evolution? Do we need God? How is prayer answered? . . . Thoughtful and sincere answers to real questions, easily read, and somewhat conservative English theology.

